The creeds : an historical and doctrinal ex
238.1 M844c 123905
Mortimer, Alfred Garnett,
Life Pacific College Alumni Library

DATE DUE

238.1
M844c

Mortimer, Alfred Garnett
Creeds

LIFE Pacific College
Alumni Library
1100 West Covina Blvd.
San Dimas, CA 91773

DEMCO

THE CREEDS

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE: An Historical and Theological Investigation of the Sacrificial Conception of the Holy Eucharist in the Christian Church. *Crown 8vo.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

CATHOLIC FAITH AND PRACTICE: A Manual of Theology. TWO PARTS. *Crown 8vo.* Sold separately. Part I. 7*s.* 6*d.* Part II. 9*s.*

JESUS AND THE RESURRECTION: Thirty Addresses for Good Friday and Easter. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

HELPS TO MEDITATION: Sketches for Every Day in the Year. Vol. I. ADVENT TO TRINITY. *8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*
Vol. II. TRINITY TO ADVENT. *8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

STORIES FROM GENESIS: Sermons for Children. *Crown 8vo.* 4*s.*

THE LAWS OF HAPPINESS: or, The Beatitudes as teaching our Duty to God, Self, and our Neighbour. *18mo.* 2*s.*

THE LAWS OF PENITENCE: Addresses on the Words of our Lord from the Cross. *16mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

SERMONS IN MINIATURE FOR EXTEMPORE PREACHERS: Sketches for Every Sunday and Holy Day of the Christian Year. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

NOTES ON THE SEVEN PENITENTIAL PSALMS, chiefly from Patristic Sources. *Small 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

MEDITATIONS ON THE PASSION. Consideration of each Scene from the Washing of the Disciples' Feet to the Scourging. *Crown 8vo.*

THE SEVEN LAST WORDS OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER: with Meditations on some Scenes in His Passion. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

LEARN OF JESUS CHRIST TO DIE Addresses on the Words of our Lord from the Cross, taken as teaching the Way of Preparation for Death. *16mo.* 2*s.*

FORTY HYMN TUNES. *8vo. Sewed,* 1*s.* 6*d.*; *cloth,* 2*s.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

THE CREEDS

AN HISTORICAL AND DOCTRINAL EXPOSITION OF THE APOSTLES', NICENE, AND ATHANASIAN CREEDS

BY THE

REV. ALFRED G. MORTIMER, D.D.

RECTOR OF S. MARK'S, PHILADELPHIA; AUTHOR OF 'HELPS TO MEDITATION,' 'CATHOLIC FAITH AND PRACTICE,' ETC.

SECOND IMPRESSION

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY
1903

All rights reserved

844c

L.I.F.E. College Library
1100 Glendale Blvd.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90026

TO

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

THE VISCOUNT HALIFAX

IN GRATEFUL RECOGNITION

OF THE VALUE OF THE EXAMPLE

OF A LIFE SPENT

IN EARNESTLY CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH

THIS VOLUME ON THE CREEDS

IS DEDICATED

032894

PREFACE

This volume was prepared at the request of Messrs. Longmans for their Oxford Library of Practical Theology; but, as the editors feel that it is written on too scientific a scale for the class of readers for whom that series is intended, it has been thought best to publish it separately.

A. G. M.

INTRODUCTORY

Among the characteristics which distinguish Christianity from all other religions of the world, one of the most prominent is its possession of a Creed and of a system of dogmatic theology. Long before the Church of Jesus Christ was founded the world had its religions; for the religious instinct is universal in human nature. But, with the exception of Judaism, of which Christianity was the offspring, all religions differed from Christianity in that they had no Creed, no Rule of Faith, no theology.

Ancient peoples worshipped their gods with religious ceremonies;[1] they offered sacrifices, they recognised a priesthood, they speculated about the immortality of the soul and the life beyond the grave, and they had their rules of conduct by which they strove to guide and restrain man in this present life; but they had no Creed and no theology. The history of their gods was interwoven with strange legends and with myths which presented in an attractive form the operations of the powers of nature; but whether these nature powers or a personal God was the true object of their worship probably few inquired, and to those who asked no definite or authoritative answer could be given.

With Christianity, and in a lesser degree with

[1] Cf. Leibnitz, Preface to *Essais de Théodicée.*

Judaism, all is quite different; for the God who revealed Himself to the Patriarchs, and more fully to Moses, revealed Himself as essentially a Personal, Self-existent Being, the Creator of heaven and earth, the Supreme Ruler of all, Who bases His claim to man's obedience on the dogma of His own essential Being, as the Alpha and Omega, the first and final cause of all things.

The dogmas first given to the Jewish Church became in a more fully developed form the foundation of Christianity, for we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews that 'God, Who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son.'[1] And while the teaching of Jesus Christ is a revelation of truth and righteousness, of dogma and morals, yet the morals are always dependent upon dogma; the laws of a righteous life rest upon right belief, and goodness is as inseparable from truth as effect is from cause.

This is clearly seen in the utterance in which our Lord reveals the purpose of His life on earth on that supreme occasion when to Pilate's question, 'Art thou a king then?' Jesus answers, 'To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.'[2] And it was in accordance with this purpose that when the High Priest said unto him, 'I adjure Thee by the living God that Thou tell us whether Thou be the Christ, the Son of God,' Jesus answered, 'Thou hast said.'[3]

Although our Blessed Lord knew that this dogmatic

[1] Heb. i. 1. [2] S. John xviii. 37.
[3] S. Matt. xxvi. 63, 64.

statement would cost Him His life, He did not shrink from uttering it. He died, therefore, not for teaching a code of morals, but for bearing witness to the dogmatic truth on which His Church is founded, that He is God.

We may observe the same theological trend in our Lord's teaching from the very beginning of His ministry, for S. Mark sums up Christ's first teaching in the words, 'Repent ye and believe the Gospel.'[1] Our Lord does not say, 'Repent and lead a holy life,' but, 'Repent and *believe* the Gospel'; and although the Gospel was the most sublime system of ethics which the world has ever known, yet, unlike all other ethical systems, it was founded absolutely on dogma, the dogma of the Being and essential Sovereignty of God, and therefore upon man's obligation to recognise God's Will as the basis, and God's revelation as the standard, of all morals.

Thus we learn that according to the teaching of Jesus Christ a right Faith is the only true foundation for a right life, that a Creed is essential to Christianity.

If we now turn in our Bibles from the Gospels to the Epistles, we find in much the same way that although dealing largely with questions of discipline, with the practical life and conduct of the Christian, and with the needs of individual Churches, yet the writers of the Epistles seem ever on the watch for an opportunity of inculcating the doctrines of the Faith, and that, by their frequent exhortations in regard to the importance of a right Faith and their warnings against error, they bear witness to the prominent

[1] S. Mark i. 15.

position which they assigned to the theological aspect of Christianity.

Many of the Epistles are indeed primarily theological treatises, as, for instance, the Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, and the First Epistle of S. John. But, even in the two which seem to have had their origin in the promptings of personal affection rather than in the difficulties of those to whom they were addressed, the Epistle to the Philippians and the First Epistle to the Thessalonians,[1] we find in the former the most sublime treatment of the doctrine of the Incarnation (Phil. ii. 5-12), and in the latter the principal eschatological teaching in Holy Scripture (1 Thess. iv.). It is not then too much to say, that throughout the New Testament, dogma is not only interwoven with ethical teaching, but is made the foundation of it.

We, however, advance a step further when we observe in the Epistles distinct indications of the existence of a recognised form of teaching which, if not precisely a Creed in our sense of the word, was certainly its precursor, and has even been thought by some to have been its actual source. For example, S. Paul says of the Romans, 'Ye obey the form of doctrine (*τύπος διδαχῆς*) into which ye were delivered';[2] and to the Galatians, 'As many as shall walk according to this Rule (*κανών*), may peace and mercy be upon them.'[3]

In both his Epistles to S. Timothy S. Paul refers to a 'deposit' (*παρακαταθήκη*) which had been com-

[1] The eschatological question, while an important part of the Epistle, seems scarcely to have been the cause of its being written.
[2] Rom. vi. 17. [3] Gal. vi. 16.

mitted to him. In the First Epistle he speaks of it as in opposition to the doctrine of false teachers, for he says: 'Oh Timothy, guard the *deposit*, turning away from the profane babblings and oppositions of science falsely termed.'[1] In the Second he parallels the 'deposit' with 'pattern of sound words,' where he writes: 'Hold the pattern of sound words which thou didst hear from me in faith and love, which is in Christ Jesus, guard the good *deposit*, through the Holy Ghost that dwelleth in us.'[2]

And in the First Epistle to the Corinthians we find a passage which seems to have been the model on which the Eastern Creeds were formed, at least so far as their first and second Articles are concerned. It reads thus:

> But to us
> 1. One God, the Father,
> Of Whom are all things, and we in Him;
> 2. And one Lord Jesus Christ,
> By Whom are all things, and we by Him.
> 1 Cor. viii. 6.

These and other passages in the New Testament, taken together with similar expressions in the earliest fathers (*e.g.* S. Irenæus, 'The Faith which the Church received from the Apostles and their disciples,'[3] 'The Ancient Tradition,' 'The Tradition of Truth'[4]), have led some to think that a common original drawn up by the Apostles was the basis of the various forms of the Creed in the Western Church.[5]

[1] 1 S. Tim. vi. 20. [2] 2 S. Tim. i. 13, 14.
[3] S. Iren., *Adv. Hær.* I. x. 1; Migne, *P.G.* vii. col. 550.
[4] *Ibid.* III. iv. 2; Migne, *P.G.* vii. col. 856.
[5] Cf. Dr. Pusey's Note on Tertullian, p. 480, *Oxford Library of the Fathers.*

Others, with perhaps greater probability, see in the summary referred to here a *norma prædicationis*. Indeed, we have only to compare the preaching of S. Peter in the earlier chapters of the Acts with similar teaching of S. Paul to see that there was a *norma prædicationis* or fixed outline of Christian doctrine, which was itself really a brief expansion of the Baptismal Formula; and indeed this Formula, without being actually the common original of the Western Creeds, was doubtless the source from whence they sprang.

In the early Churches we find something even more definite, a *Symbolum*. Hence, in studying the Creeds, we are carried back to the earliest ages of the Church and to the skeletons around which all her dogmatic theology has grown.

In investigating the Creeds there are obviously two methods which we may apply, the dogmatic and the historical method. We may take the Creeds as we have them now in their perfected form and consider what they teach, or we may trace them back to their source, examining the conditions out of which they grew and the questions and difficulties they were intended to meet. In many respects this latter method is the best, but in its exclusive application it labours under two disadvantages which in our case are insuperable:

(1) It involves the study of the history of the first five centuries of the Church, with a detailed examination of the various heresies and philosophies, to refute which the Eastern Creeds were formulated; but this alone would require a far larger volume than is at our disposal.

(2) Then, on the other hand, this, if completed, while it would be interesting and satisfactory to scholars, would not altogether supply the needs of a large class of readers for whom this volume is designed. Moreover, such historical treatises are already in existence. It is, therefore, evident that the method of this book cannot be exclusively historical.

If, however, we take the dogmatic method alone, that is, the study of the doctrines of the Church as expounded by the Church in her ordinary teaching and as proved from Holy Scripture, and leave out altogether the history of the Creeds, we shall find this also unsatisfactory, in that it leaves many important and interesting questions untouched. It would, therefore, seem best in this little book to try to combine the two methods at least thus far :

(1) First, to give a sketch of the history of the Creeds which, while brief, shall give a fair idea of our present historical knowledge in regard to them.

(2) Then to group the Articles of the three Creeds under the headings of the Articles of the Apostles' Creed, and to examine their teaching in the light of Holy Scripture and of the theology of the Church.

(3) No attempt will be made to prove the various Articles from Holy Scripture, though passages will be sometimes quoted to illustrate them. Our aim will rather be to give an uncontroversial exposition of the Creed as we find it developed in the ordinary theology of the Church. It must be remembered that this is not a systematic treatise on Dogmatic Theology, but only an Exposition of the Creeds. Hence many

subjects which would necessarily have found place in the former are omitted, and in those which are given the limits of space often preclude that fulness of discussion which in a larger volume might be expected.

The three Creeds are commonly known as the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian Creed, but, as we shall presently show, these titles in each case require to be somewhat qualified, since the sources suggested by the titles are not borne out by the history of the Creeds themselves, that is, they cannot in their present form be traced back respectively to the Apostles, to the Council of Nicæa, and to S. Athanasius.

Of the three Creeds the Western Creed, which we speak of as the Apostles' Creed, is by far the most ancient; for, if we except the two Articles, 'He descended into hell' and the 'Communion of Saints,' it came into existence about or shortly before the middle of the second century. This, Professor Harnack tells us, we may regard as an assured result of historical research, while other great scholars would carry back the date some fifty years. The so-called Nicene Creed is but an expansion of this Western Creed (or of the original Creed from which both Eastern and Western Creeds sprang) rendered necessary by certain heresies in the fourth century.

The Creed to which the name of S. Athanasius is attached, while probably traceable to the first half of the fifth century, did not come into existence until at least fifty years after the death of S. Athanasius, and did not originate in the east, but in the south of Gaul.

Of the three Creeds the so-called Nicene Creed can

alone be strictly termed Œcumenical in the sense that it alone has received the formal sanction of the Church; and, with the exception of the clauses 'and from the Son,' and 'God of God,' it alone is accepted and used by the whole Church, both East and West, the use of the Apostles' Creed and the Creed of S. Athanasius being confined, so far as their public recitation is concerned, to the Western Church, although the latter finds a place in the Horologion of the Greek Church.

In order to avoid encumbering the text all the Creeds to which we have had occasion to refer have been relegated to the Appendices. In Appendix A will be found the various forms of the Apostles' Creed, in B the Nicene, and in C the Athanasian. A note has been added to each giving the date and source.

For convenience of reference in quoting passages from the Fathers we have given not only the book and chapter, but also the volume and column where the passage may be found in Migne's *Patrologia.*

CONTENTS

PART I—HISTORY

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	THE LITERATURE OF THE APOSTLES' CREED	3
II.	THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES' CREED	11
III.	THE GROWTH OF THE APOSTLES' CREED	31
IV.	PROBLEMS SUGGESTED BY THE HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES' CREED	49
V.	OUR NICENE CREED	57
VI.	THE LATER HISTORY OF THE NICENE CREED	73
VII.	THE ATHANASIAN CREED	86

PART II—EXPOSITION

I.	ARTICLE I :—	
	I. Of Faith	104
	II. Of God	110
	III. Of the Holy Trinity	118
	IV. Of the Father Almighty	128
	V. Of Creation	129
II.	ARTICLE II :—	
	I. Of Jesus Christ	132
	II. Of the Only Begotten Son of God	136
	III. Of Jesus Christ our Lord	138
III.	ARTICLE III :—	
	Of the Incarnation	140
IV.	ARTICLE IV :—	
	Of the Atonement	153

CHAP. PAGE

V. ARTICLE V :—
I. Of our Lord's Descent into Hell 173
II. Of our Lord's Resurrection 181

VI. ARTICLE VI :—
Of the Ascension, Session, and Reign of our Lord . 190

VII. ARTICLE VII :—
Of the Judgment 200

VIII. ARTICLE VIII :—
Of the Holy Ghost 209

IX. ARTICLE IX :—
I. Of the Church 224
II. Of the Communion of Saints 247

X. ARTICLE X :—
Of the Forgiveness of Sins 253

XI. ARTICLE XI :—
Of the Resurrection of the Body 263

XII. ARTICLE XII :—
Of the Life Everlasting 275

PART III—APPENDICES

APPENDIX A :—
Documents relating to the Apostles' Creed . . 291

APPENDIX B :—
Documents relating to the Nicene Creed . . . 302

APPENDIX C :—
The Athanasian Creed 304

INDEX 307

ERRATA

Page 7, line 11, *for* Methuen *read* Hodder & Stoughton.
,, 28, note 1, *for* 289, n. *read* 298, n. 45.
,, 46, note 4, *for* 301 *read* 300.
,, 75, note 7, *for* Græca *read* Græcos.
,, 86, line 21, *for* Swainson *read* Ommanney.
,, 126, line 28, *for* πρόσωπα *read* πρόσωπον.
,, 309, line 51, *for* Contesseravit *read* Contesserarit.
Pages 86, 87, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 97, *for* Ommaney *read* Ommanney.

PART I

HISTORY

CHAPTER I

THE LITERATURE OF THE APOSTLES' CREED

Before we approach the history of the Apostles' Creed it will be well for us briefly to review the literature of the subject, and especially to examine cursorily some of the more important contributions which are the fruits of the recent great activity in this branch of theological research.

The fact that our space forbids any detailed discussion of the many problems suggested by these researches makes it the more needful that we should be able to refer the reader to the works of others in which such treatment finds place, and should give him some idea of the standpoints from which the various writers regard their subject. If we are not able to claim for English theologians of the present day the highest places in original work on the history of the Apostles' Creed, it is a matter of congratulation that our German contemporaries recognise that the pioneers in this field were two Englishmen, Archbishop Ussher and Dr. Heurtley.

While the earliest critical writers on the Creed were Laurentius Valla (*ob.* 1457) and Erasmus (*ob.* 1536), both of whom disputed the traditional view that the Creed was actually drawn up by the Apostles, it was not until the seventeenth century that the value of the documentary evidence for the character and origin of the Creed was seriously considered.

In 1642 Gerard Jean Voss put forth his work *De*

Tribus Symbolis, in which he attempted to investigate the historical evidence for the antiquity of the Creeds; and five years later James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh, in his great work *De Symbolo Romano*, replied to Voss, taking exception especially to the date (the ninth century) which he assigned to the Athanasian Creed. He supported his opinion by reference to two manuscripts which he had found in the Cotton Library: the older, which is generally known as the Utrecht Psalter, Ussher judged to be not later than the time of Gregory the Great; the other, generally known as the Athelstan Psalter, to have been written about the year 703. Modern criticism has not sustained the verdict of Ussher in regard to the dates of those two manuscripts, but it has accorded to him the credit of being the pioneer in this field of investigation.

Ussher's work was followed in the next decade (1659) by Bishop Pearson's great treatise on the Creed, which was, however, written from a dogmatic rather than from an historical point of view. Then there appeared in Holland in 1681 the treatise of Hermann Witsen, *Exercitationes Sacræ in Symbolum quod Apostolorum dicitur*.

In England there appeared in 1702 Lord King's *History of the Apostles' Creed*, and in 1708-1722 Bingham's *Origenes*, book x. of which is devoted to the sources of the Apostles' Creed. In 1770 Walch published his *Bibliotheca Symbolorum Veterum*, and in 1842 Hahn put forth his *Bibliothek der Symbole*, but no great advance in the historico-critical method was made in these works.

The great impulse to the more thorough investigation of the history and origin of the Apostles' Creed was given by the appearance in 1858 of the *Harmonia Symbolica* of the Rev. Dr. Heurtley, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford. This work, which may be said to have inaugurated a new era in the

study of the Creeds, exhibits them in chronological order, showing their variations, and noting the date at which the phrases which eventually found their way into the present Creed first made their appearance in the more ancient forms. To this was added a brief historical review of the several articles of the Creed. And this was supplemented some years later by Dr. Heurtley's *De fide et Symbolo documenta quædam*, etc. (ed. tert. 1884).

If to Dr. Heurtley belongs the first place in order of time among the new school of investigators into the documentary evidence for the Apostles' Creed, it is to Dr. Caspari that we must assign the highest place for independent work in this field. Indeed, it is not too much to say that his labours have rendered possible the library of scientific treatises on the subject which has appeared within the past quarter of a century. He provided material which others worked upon. He discovered the rich ore from which others are still engaged in laboriously extracting precious treasure.

Dr. C. P. Caspari, Professor of Theology in the University of Norway, having already made for himself a reputation in the fields of Old Testament exegesis, in 1866 put forth the first of his University Programmes entitled *Ungedruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel.* To the work of accumulating a mass of carefully sifted material in preparation for a history of the Creed he devoted the remainder of his life (*ob.* 1892). Libraries were ransacked both in England and on the Continent, manuscripts collated, and the results of his work given to the world in a series of publications issued respectively in 1866, 1869, 1875, 1879, and 1890.

Caspari seems to have been content with collecting rich stores of material from which others have built up theories, the only opinion which he allowed himself to

express being found in a paragraph of some five lines in the midst of detailed researches:

'After what we have been saying, we may, and indeed must, assume that the Creed came to Rome on the boundary line between the Apostolic and the sub-Apostolic age, substantially in the form which it has in the old Roman Creed, and probably from Asia Minor, from the Johannine Circle, which may well have been its birthplace.'[1]

To Caspari every student of the Creeds is under the deepest obligation, but the somewhat confusing arrangement of his work and the lack of an index leads most students to use Hahn's *Bibliothek*, which, however, in its latest form largely owes its value to the material gathered by Caspari.

In 1892 Dr. Adolf Harnack, Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin, published his famous pamphlet *Das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss: ein geschichtlicher Bericht nebst einem Nachwort*, which, after passing through some twenty-five editions within a year in Germany, was translated by Mrs. Humphrey Ward, and appeared (with a preface by her) in the *Century* for July 1893. In this pamphlet Dr. Harnack does not confine himself to the *history* of the Creed, but advances opinions tending to discredit the Creed as teaching Apostolic doctrine. For he not only contends that even the earliest form of the Apostles' Creed (Roman) contains articles of faith in excess of the Apostolic teaching, *e.g.* the miraculous conception of our Lord and the Resurrection of the flesh, but that even those articles which he acknowledges to be primitive have received interpretations which are foreign to their original meaning in the Creed. Under this last head he places the terms 'Father,' 'Only Son,' and 'Holy Ghost,' as interpreted of the hypostatic Trinity.

[1] Caspari, *Quellen*, iii. 161.

These opinions are supported not by arguments, which the limits of his pamphlet do not permit him to employ, but merely by the authority which attaches to his own name as one of the greatest historical scholars of the day. They have been met and refuted by many, perhaps most thoroughly by Professor Zahn in 1893 in his *Das Apostolische Symbolum*. An English translation of this valuable work, for which we are indebted to the Rev. A. E. Burn and C. E. Burn, appeared in 1899 under the title *The Apostles' Creed* (Methuen).

In 1894 Dr. Swete, Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, put forth a most careful and convincing examination of Harnack's pamphlet, so far at least as the *opinions* referred to are concerned. This little book, while on quite different lines from Dr. Zahn's, is not less satisfactory, and both may be commended to such English readers as may have been disturbed by the theories of Harnack and his school.

Harnack's work on the Creed is by no means confined to the above pamphlet. We have a more recent summary of his views in the article on the Apostles' Creed contributed to the second edition of the *Hauck-Herzog Real-Encyclopädie*, an English translation of which, as it stands in the third edition, has recently (1901) been presented to English readers by the Rev. Stewart Means, revised and edited by Thomas Bailey Saunders (A. and C. Black, London).[1]

In 1893 there appeared Zahn's work *Das Apostolische Symbolum*, to which we have already referred. It consists of two parts: the first is a somewhat discursive examination of the history of the old Roman Creed;

[1] Besides these two works Dr. Harnack has contributed many papers on the Creed to various theological reviews. He discusses it also in his *Patr. App. Opp.* (pub. 1878); in his *History of Dogma*, vol. i. cap. iii.; also in the Appendix to the third edition of Hahn's *Bibliothek der Symbole*.

the second, a treatise on the separate articles of the Creed as we now use it. It has the great merit of having been written from an orthodox standpoint. It is perhaps original in suggesting a Roman recension of the first article in the early years of the third century, and in tracing the earliest form of the Creed back to a baptismal confession which had taken shape in the Apostolic age.

In 1894 and 1895 Dr. Loofs contributed to the subject some papers in the *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*. He suggests that the Creed-like passages in *Irenæus* (with one exception) are distinctively Eastern, and were probably brought by him from Smyrna, and that this would carry back the Eastern type of Creed to the middle of the second century, whereas Harnack and Kattenbusch refuse to recognise an Eastern type before the end of the third century (*c.* 272).

In 1895 Dr. J. Kunze put forth his *Marcus Eremita*, and in 1899 his *Glaubensregeln*. In the former work he tries to prove that the Creed of Mark the Hermit is really the local Creed of Ancyra, and so to establish a local Creed for Galatia. In his *Glaubensregeln* he combats Kattenbusch's view that there was a sharp distinction between the East and West in regard to the 'Rule of Faith': that in the East it was the Scriptures, and in the West the Creed. Kunze would make the 'Rule of Faith' embrace both the Scriptures and the Creed, though he recognises that individual writers might lean sometimes more to the one than to the other.

In 1900 Dr. Carl Clemen's *Niedergefahren zu den Toten* appeared, his work being on the 'Descensus ad inferos.' He treats only incidentally the other articles of the Creed, though the 'Sanctorum Communio' is dealt with in some detail.

In the same year Dr. J. P. Kirsch put forth the

first volume of a work on the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, in which this article of the Creed is carefully examined. He advances the view that Nicetas of Remesiana (in whose writings the clause 'Sanctorum Communio' is first found) received his form of Creed from Gaul and not from the East, as is commonly held.

In 1898 the first part of Dr. Bernhard Dörholt's *Das Taufsymbolum der alten Kirche* was published. In it he brings forward the view of a Polish Jesuit, Marian Morawski, who in the *Zeitschrift für Kath. Theologie* (1895) suggests, from the prevalence of the clause 'Sub Pontio Pilato' in the very earliest Creed-forms, that the choice of a procurator of Judea (in preference to an emperor or consul), for the purpose of fixing the date of our Lord's Crucifixion, implies that the author of the Creed was a provincial and that his province was Judea. These last two writers belong to the Roman Catholic Communion.

Let us now turn back to the principal works on the Creed which have appeared in England, and let us start from Heurtley's great work *Harmonia Symbolica* in 1858, to which we have already referred.

In 1872 Rev. Edmund Ffoulkes put forth a book on *The Athanasian Creed . . . with other Inquiries on Creeds in General.* The extravagance of some of his hypotheses is exposed by Dr. Lumby.[1]

This was followed in 1873 by Dr. Lumby's *The History of the Creeds*, a work of much interest and at the time of considerable value.

In 1875 Canon Swainson published his work on *The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, which also contained an account of the Athanasian Creed. This was the most elaborate work on the subject up to that date, though some of its hypotheses would now find no supporters, as, for instance, that Marcellus of Ancyra was *the*

[1] Lumby's *The History of the Creeds*, p. 127.

author of the Roman Creed. It, however, contains much interesting material.

The latest, and in some respects most valuable, of English works on the Creed is the Rev. A. E. Burn's *An Introduction to the Creeds*, published in 1898. Mr. Burn is a follower of Zahn, though there is in his work much of original research and theory, and it may be recommended to readers who desire a fuller account of the Creeds than the limits of this volume allow, as the most satisfactory work in English on this subject.

We must not, however, close this list without grateful reference to two most interesting and helpful articles[1] by Dr. Sanday, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford, in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for October 1899 and October 1901. These articles are entitled respectively *Recent Research on the Origin of the Creed* and *Further Research in the History of the Creed*, and they summarise in a very luminous manner the opinions of recent German writers upon the subject.

[1] To these articles, as to many other of Dr. Sanday's works, the author is very greatly indebted.

CHAPTER II

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES' CREED

The time has not yet come when a complete history of the Apostles' Creed can be written, perhaps it may never come; and yet this is not so much from lack of materials for a history as from the difficulty of interpreting them.

The manuscripts collated by Caspari and others, and contained in the latest (third) edition of Hahn's *Bibliothek der Symbole*, form a store from which a great history might be expected, but so far they have only afforded material for conflicting theories in regard to most of the questions raised. On this account, and for the sake of clearness, we shall divide our treatment of the early history of the Apostles' Creed into two parts, in the first indicating the sources of the Creed, so far as scholars seem to have reached an agreement in regard to them; and reserving as much as possible for a separate chapter those problems connected with its early history for which no authoritative solution can yet be said to have been found.

I. The Apostles' Creed, precisely as we have it in our service-books to-day, is first found in the writings of Pirminius (or Priminius) about the year 750. It is contained in a short treatise published by Mabillon from an ancient manuscript entitled *Libellus Pirminii de singulis libris canonicis scarapsus*.[1]

[1] Mabillon, *Analecta*, tom. iv. p. 575.

The birthplace of Pirminius is unknown. He is, however, said to have left his native country and to have gone into France, and then into Germany, preaching the Gospel, and to have been a most successful missionary. He founded several monasteries and died in one of them, Hornbach, about the year 758.

In his treatise the Creed is found twice, the first time with the story of the several articles having been contributed each by an Apostle, and with the respective articles assigned to their supposed authors. The other Creed is given as it was used in the baptismal service. These Creeds are precisely similar to that which we now use, except that in the fifth article we find 'ad inferna' instead of 'ad inferos.'[1]

Many Creeds extending back more than a century before this are very similar to ours, and if we take them together we can find in them all the articles of our Creed, but the Creed of Pirminius is the first which is really identical with ours in every article.

II. If we go back nearly four centuries we find in three independent documents evidence of the existence of a Creed so much like our own as to be evidently its ancestor, and this Creed we learn was the Creed of the Roman Church.

i. About the year 400 Rufinus, a presbyter of the Church of Aquileia, wrote a commentary on the Creed of the Church of Aquileia, in which he carefully points out the differences between his Creed and that of the Roman Church. While he does not in his exposition in any one place give the Creed in full, yet as he comments on the different articles it is not difficult to reconstruct the Creed on which he is commenting by separating it from the context.[2] From the work of Rufinus we learn three important facts:

[1] Cf. Creed of Pirminius, Appendix A, p. 299.
[2] Cf. Creed of Rufinus, Appendix A, p. 295.

1. What the Roman Creed was in his day.

2. That in his time the tradition that the Creed was composed by the Apostles before they left Jerusalem was known and accepted.

3. That in other churches additions had been made to the Creed to meet certain heresies, but that the Church in Rome had remained free from heresy, and had kept up the ancient custom that candidates for baptism should repeat the Creed publicly, so that no additions had been permitted.

ii. The second document which we have to consider is a sermon entitled 'Explanatio symboli ad initiandos.'[1] It is found in three manuscripts[2] and assigned to three different authors; in the oldest, which is found in the Vatican Library and is said to have come from Bobbio, it is ascribed to S. Ambrose. In the others it is ascribed respectively to S. Maximus of Turin and S. Augustine.

Caspari,[3] who discusses the question very thoroughly, reaches the conclusion that it is undoubtedly the work of S. Ambrose, and his opinion is accepted by Harnack, Zahn, and most scholars, though Kattenbusch assigns to it a date later than the work of Rufinus, thinking that he finds in it traces of quotations from Rufinus. His opinion, however, has few followers, and we may safely accept the view which regards it as an undoubted work of S. Ambrose.

S. Ambrose, like Rufinus, testifies that the Roman Church preserved the exact words of the Creed with the most scrupulous fidelity, and like him gives the legend of the symbol having been composed by the Apostles. Indeed, the Apostolic origin of this symbol is also independently asserted by S. Jerome,[4] by the

[1] Cf. Creed of S. Ambrose, Appendix A, p. 295.
[2] (1) Cod. Vat., 5760; (2) Cod. Lamb.; (3) Cod. S. Gall., 188.
[3] Caspari, *Quellen*, II. xiv. pp. 48-127.
[4] *Liber contra Joann. Hierosol.*, c. xxviii. Migne, *P. L.* xxiii. col. 380.

Roman Bishops Celestin I., Sixtus III., Leo I., by Vigilius of Thapsus, and in the *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*.[1] All these wrote between the years 422 and 461, so that the belief in the Apostolic origin of the Creed may be said to have been generally received in Rome by the end of the fourth century.

iii. By far the most important witness to the Roman Creed in the fourth century is Marcellus of Ancyra. Marcellus had defended the orthodox faith at the Council of Nicæa, and so had drawn upon himself the enmity of the Arian party, and through their influence he was anathematised, deposed, and banished. He repaired to Rome and remained there about fifteen months, and on leaving in the year 341 addressed a letter to Julius, Bishop of Rome, asserting his orthodoxy and giving the Creed, which he says was 'the faith he had been taught by his forefathers in God out of the Sacred Scriptures, and which he had himself been accustomed to preach in the Church of God.'

We find this letter and Creed in the *Treatise on Heresies* of S. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis.[2] From the wording of his letter we should have supposed the Creed to be the local Creed of Ancyra, but, as Archbishop Ussher first pointed out, it is not an Eastern Creed at all, but the Creed of the Roman Church, and evidently adopted by Marcellus as a proof of his orthodoxy.

It corresponds precisely with the Roman Creed as given by Rufinus, with the exception of the omission of the word 'Father' in the first article, and the addition of the clause 'life everlasting' in the last.[3] The omission certainly, and possibly the addition, may be accounted for by the carelessness of copyists, the manuscripts in which this part of the text of

[1] Caspari, ii. 108, iii. 94.
[2] Epiph., *Hæres.* LXXII. (Migne, *P. G.* xlii. col. 385).
[3] Cf. Creed of Marcellus, Appendix A, p. 295.

Epiphanius is preserved being full of errors, though the 'life everlasting' at that date is distinctly Eastern.

We are thus enabled to compare our Creed (which hereafter will be signified by the letter 'T.'—Textus receptus) with that in use in the Roman Church in the year 341 (which we shall refer to as 'R.'—Roman), and in doing so we observe that our Creed is undoubtedly only a development of the Roman Creed, the following clauses, 'Maker of heaven and earth,' 'He descended into hell,' 'the Communion of Saints,' having been added, and the words 'conceived' in the third article, 'suffered' and 'dead' in the fourth, 'God' and 'Almighty' in the seventh, 'Catholic' in the ninth, and 'life everlasting' in the twelfth. This will be seen in the following parallel:

CREED OF MARCELLUS.	TEXTUS RECEPTUS.
I.—1. I believe in God Almighty.	I.—1. I believe in God [the Father] Almighty, [Maker of heaven and earth]:
II.—2. And in Christ Jesus His only [Begotten] Son, our Lord,	II.—2. And in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord,
3. Born of the Holy Ghost and Mary the Virgin,	3. Who was [conceived] by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary,
4. Under Pontius Pilate crucified and buried,	4. [Suffered] under Pontius Pilate was crucified [dead] and buried.
5. And the third day rose again from the dead,	5. [He descended into hell] The third day He rose again from the dead,
6. Ascended into heaven,	6. He ascended into heaven,

7. And sitteth on the right hand of the Father,	7. And sitteth on the right hand of [God] the Father [Almighty]
8. From whence He cometh to judge quick and dead,	8. From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.
III.—9. And in the Holy Ghost,	III.—9. [I believe] in the Holy Ghost,
10. [the] holy Church.	10. the holy [Catholic] Church, [the Communion of Saints],
11. [the] forgiveness of sins,	11. the forgiveness of sins,
12. [the] resurrection of the flesh, [the life everlasting].	12. the resurrection of the body [and the life everlasting].

III. We have now before us two distinct tasks:

(1) To trace 'R.' back to its earliest known sources.

(2) To trace 'R.' upward to its complete development in 'T.'

But before proceeding to this work it is necessary to make some preliminary remarks about Creed-forms in the earliest ages of the Church. The form from which all Creeds have sprung is undoubtedly the Baptismal formula to which, *in obedience to our Lord's injunction*, were added certain explanatory teachings.[1] Just before His Ascension our Lord said to His disciples: 'Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen.'

This passage forms the conclusion of the Gospel of

[1] 'Dehinc ter mergitamur *amplius aliquid respondentes* quam Dominus in euangelio determinauit.'—Tert., *De Cor. Milit.* c. 3. Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 79.

S. Matthew, and may be regarded as the germ of all the Creeds. We may observe, first, that these words are associated with the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism, and in the early Church we find the profession of faith inseparably connected with the Sacrament of Baptism, by which men were made members of the Body of Christ, so much so that in S. Cyprian the Creed is called the 'Sacramentum fidei.'

At first but little was added to the Baptismal formula. Later this was developed into a 'Symbolum,' or watchword, containing the principal tenets of the Christian Faith, and this again was developed by way of instruction to catechumens preparing for Baptism. Hence we must recognise three allied but distinct developments of the Baptismal formula in the direction of the Creed. There was:

(i) The interrogatory Creed of Baptism, which was always very brief, and consisted of little more than a confession of faith in the Holy Trinity, and in the remission of sins, and sometimes in the life everlasting through the Holy Church.

(ii) The Symbolum proper, which was imparted just before and recited just after the administration of Baptism; and

(iii) The Rule of Faith, or brief commentary on the Creed given as an instruction to catechumens preparing for Baptism. This expression 'The Rule of Faith' was, however, also frequently used for the Creed itself.

We have perhaps the best example of the contemporary existence of these three Creed-forms in the same Church in the Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril of Jerusalem. These lectures were delivered when S. Cyril was only a priest, about the year 347, the five on the Mysteries in the Church of the Resurrection at Jerusalem, the earlier ones in the Basilica of the Holy Cross.

(i) In Lecture 19, section 9, we read: 'When, there-

fore, thou renouncest Satan, utterly breaking every compact with him, the old treaty with hell, God opened to thee the Paradise which He planted toward the East, whence for his transgression our first father was driven out, and symbolical of this was thy turning from the West to the East, the place of light. Then thou wert told to say: *I believe in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and in one Baptism of Repentance.*'[1]

This Baptismal Confession was always put to the catechumens at Baptism in an interrogative form, and is generally spoken of as the 'Interrogatio de fide.' Indeed, before the Reformation the Apostles' Creed, as we now have it, was never used at Baptism either as a declaratory or as an interrogatory Creed. The clauses omitted were fewer at one time and more numerous at another; but the essential parts of the Baptismal Confession were probably very much the same as those still retained in the Baptismal office of the Roman Church.

(ii) In Lecture 5, section 12, S. Cyril writes: 'For since all cannot read the Scriptures, but some are hindered from the knowledge of them by lack of learning, others by lack of leisure, in order that the soul may not perish through ignorance, in the Articles which are few we comprehend the whole doctrine of the Faith. This I wish you to remember—even the very words—and to rehearse it with all diligence by yourself, not writing it on paper, but graving it on the tablets of your heart; being watchful during your meditation, lest haply some of the catechumens overhear the things delivered to you. This I wish you to keep all through your life as a provision for the way. . . . And for the present commit to memory the Faith, merely listening to the words, and expect at the fitting season the proof of each of its parts

[1] S. Cyril of Jer. Migne, *P. G.* xxxiii. col. 1073.

from the Divine Scriptures. For the Articles of the Faith were not composed at the good pleasure of men, but the most important points chosen from all Scripture make up the one teaching of the Faith.'[1]

From this passage of S. Cyril we learn that in his time there was, in addition to the Baptismal Confession, a distinct Creed or 'Articles of Faith,' drawn from Holy Scripture, and making up the one teaching of the Faith. In Lectures 6-18 (inclusive), we have an exposition of these Articles of the Creed. While the Creed itself, in accordance with the injunction of secrecy already noticed, is nowhere given in full, yet it is not difficult to reconstruct it from the Commentary, and this has been done.[2]

In the sermons or instructions upon the Creed which have come down to us from the fourth and fifth centuries, we observe that the greatest stress is laid upon the importance of secrecy in regard to it, so much so that S. Cyril and S. Augustine warned their hearers never to commit it to writing, to engrave it only upon the tablets of the memory; and, in connection with this injunction, we may fitly consider the term 'Symbol,' by which the Apostles' Creed is so generally known.

The word seems to occur first in S. Cyprian,[3] and there is some difference of opinion as to its meaning, some deriving it from *σύμβολον*, which means a sign, token, or watchword; others from *συμβολή*, which signifies a collation or summary. Rufinus gives both meanings; S. Ambrose in his *Explanatio Symboli*, to which we have already referred, gives only the latter. There can, however, be very little doubt that the former is the correct derivation, and that the word

[1] S. Cyril Hier. Migne, *P. G.* xxxiii. col. 520.

[2] In Appendix B, p. 303, we give S. Cyril's Creed as thus reconstructed in Hahn.

[3] S. Cyp., *Ep.* 69, *Ad Magnum*, c. vii. Migne, *P. L.* iii. col. 1143.

'Symbol' as used for the Creed indicates that it was a 'watchword,' such as the 'password' of a soldier.

This is made almost certain by the word which Tertullian uses to describe it. He says: 'Videamus, quid didicerit, quid docuerit, quid cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis *contesserarit*.'[1]

The Latin word *tessera*, which corresponds to the Greek *σύμβολον*, signified a square tablet on which a watchword was written, or a tally or token which was divided between two friends, in order that by means of it they or their descendants might always recognise each other.[2] Hence Tertullian's use of the word *contesserarit* evidently implies that by the Symbol he understood a watchword by which orthodox Christians might recognise one another.

It is of importance that we should realise how carefully the early Christians guarded the Symbol, since this fully accounts for the entire absence of any manuscripts containing it. There are many instructions on the Creed from which we can reconstruct with a fair amount of accuracy the Symbol as it then existed, but of the Symbol itself the earliest example which we possess is that contained in the *Hæresies* of S. Epiphanius, that is, the Roman Creed as professed by Marcellus in his letter to Pope Julius in the year 341.

(iii) In addition to the Baptismal Confession and to the Symbol proper, we find in S. Cyril and other writers brief instructions on the Articles of Faith, which have sometimes been spoken of as 'The Rule of Faith.' These differ from the Symbol in that they are more diffuse and that they are not confined to any precise form of words. S. Irenæus, for instance, speaks of 'The Rule of Truth' (*ὁ κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας*),[3]

[1] Tert., *De Præscr.* 36. Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 49.
[2] Cf. the article on *tesseræ* in Pitisco, tome iii. pp. 577-580.
[3] Iren., *Contr. Hær.* I. ix. 4. Migne, *P. G.* vii. col. 545.

Tertullian of 'The Rule of Faith';[1] and other writers, of 'The Faith,' 'The Apostolic Preaching,' 'The Apostolic Tradition,' etc.

S. Isidore of Seville in his work on *The Ecclesiastical Offices*[2] gives the tradition that the Apostles, before they parted, drew up a Creed which became in process of time a Symbolum or watchword; but he adds that *after* the 'Symbol' of the Apostles there is the most certain 'Faith' which our teachers have handed down, we profess that the Father and Son and Holy Spirit are of one essence, etc., and he concludes the chapter by saying, 'This is the true entirety of the Catholic Religion and Faith.' Hence S. Isidore recognises a distinction between the 'Symbol' and 'The Rule of Faith.'

The Symbol was always restricted to the Sacrament of Baptism. This was solemnly administered at Easter and Pentecost, and the candidates were prepared carefully by instruction in the Christian religion. A few days before their Baptism the 'Symbol' was delivered to them, accompanied by a sermon, such as we find among the works of S. Augustine.[3] This ceremony was known as the 'Traditio Symboli,' the Delivery of the Creed. After the Baptism the candidate publicly recited the Creed, and this was called the 'Redditio Symboli,' and for a long period Baptism was the only public service of the Church at which the Creed was used.

IV. With this introduction we can take up the first task we have set before us, that of tracing 'R.' to its earliest known source. We have seen that we have 'R.' in the year 341 in the letter of Marcellus

[1] Tert., *De Præscr. Hæret.* c. xiii., *et alibi.* Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 26.
[2] Isid. Sev., *De eccles. officiis*, lib. ii. c. xxii.-xxiii. Migne, *P. L.* lxxxiii. col. 815, 816.
[3] *E.g.* S. Aug., *Serm.* 212-215. Migne, *P. L.* xxxviii. col. 1058-1076.

to Pope Julius. We can at once go back a century and find in various writers traces of it sufficient to convince us that it was in use at that time. We cannot expect to find the Symbol itself for the reason we have already set forth, that it was never reduced to writing, but we do find in various theological works phrases constantly recurring which evidently formed part of the Creed.

For instance, about the year 260 we have a work by Novatian entitled *De Trinitate*, founded upon the teaching of Tertullian, whose phrase, 'Regula veritatis,' Novatian uses with obvious reference to the Symbol. While Novatian's Creed, which as we know had been transmitted orally, does not correspond with 'R.' in its exact words, yet it does so very strikingly in substance, as may be seen by a reference to it.[1]

Novatian was a priest of the Church of Rome who had obtained schismatical consecration in opposition to Pope Cornelius.

About the same time (perhaps a year earlier) we find some fragments of the epistles and writings of Bishop Dionysius of Rome, contained in a work of S. Athanasius,[2] in which there is a very clear reference to the three principal Articles of the Symbol, each clause corresponding precisely both in words and in their order with the Greek Creed of Marcellus, excepting that the word 'Father,' which is omitted by Marcellus, is inserted in its right place.

Earlier still, in the letters of S. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage (*c.* 255), we find two distinct references to a Baptismal Creed: 'Dost thou believe in the Remission of Sins and Life Eternal through the Holy Church?' (*Ep.* 69); and 'Dost thou believe in the Life Eternal

[1] Cf. Creed of Novatian, Appendix A, p. 294.

[2] S. Athan., *De decretis Nicænæ synodi*, c. 26. Migne, *P. G.* xxv. col. 466. Cf. Appendix A, p. 293.

and the Remission of Sins through the Holy Church?' (*Ep.* 70).[1]

We may sum up this section by quotations from Dr. Harnack and Dr. Zahn. The former says, 'That the shorter Roman Symbol, (as represented in the Epistle of Marcellus and in the *Psalterium Aethelstani*), which was, as early as about the year 250, the predominant one in Rome, must be regarded as one of the most positive results of historical investigation.'[2]

Dr. Zahn writes: 'Nearly all the Articles of the Creed, as it was repeated in Rome from 250-450, may be found in Irenæus and Tertullian.'[3]

V. We have seen that, in the opinion of Dr. Harnack, it is one of the most positive results of historical investigation that 'R.' was in existence and predominant in Rome about the year 250. It now remains for us to inquire how much earlier than this we can find traces of 'R.' Rufinus (*c.* 400) calls our attention to the fact that, while additions had been made to the Creed in other Churches in order to meet certain heresies which had arisen in those Churches, the Roman Creed had never been altered; since the Church in Rome had remained free from heresy, and, besides this, had kept up the ancient custom that candidates for Baptism should repeat the Creed publicly, so that no additions had been permitted.

The accuracy of the statement of Rufinus concerning both the fixed character of 'R.' and the fact that no additions to it had been permitted can be proved from independent evidence, but the reason which he gives, that the Church in Rome had remained free from heresy, while doubtless true for a century or more before his day, is the very opposite to the truth

[1] Cf. Creed of S. Cyprian, Appendix A, p. 293.
[2] Harnack, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 22 (Eng. Trans.).
[3] Zahn, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 45 (Eng. Trans.).

when we go back before the year 250. For in the century from 130-230 Rome was the centre of all the attacks made on the Christian Faith under the guise of a truer Christianity. First Valentinus, then Marcion, then the so-called Monarchianists, Theodotus and Praxeas, made Rome the centre of their activity, and Patripassian and Gnostic heresies everywhere abounded in Rome.

Now if it be true, as Rufinus states, that 'R.' had received no additions to meet heresies, it must have been because 'R.' had been compiled and fixed in its Articles *before these heresies arose*; for had it been drawn up at any period in the century after Valentinus and Marcion came to Rome, it would certainly have been coloured by their heresies, that is, clauses would have been inserted to meet and refute these heresies. The extreme simplicity of 'R.' and its entire freedom from any such theological bias makes it, however, practically certain that it had reached its fixed form before Valentinus and Marcion began their teaching in Rome.

According to the express statement of Irenæus,[1] Valentinus came to Rome in the time of Pope Hyginus, flourished under Pius, and remained there till Anicetus. According to this his stay at Rome must have been between the years 138-160. From references to Valentinus in Clement of Alexandria,[2] and Tertullian,[3] this date is practically confirmed.

Marcion, who was the son of a Bishop of Pontus, perhaps the Bishop of Sinope, having been excommunicated by his father, came to Rome. The fact of his excommunication shows that he must have been a baptized Christian. He separated from the Roman Church about the year 145, but during the negotia-

[1] Iren. III. iv. 3. Migne, *P. G.* viii. col. 856, 857.
[2] Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VII. xvii. Migne, *P. G.* ix. col. 550.
[3] Tert., *De Præscr. Hær.* 30. Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 42.

tions with the Roman clergy which preceded his separation he must, on account of his excommunication, have made a declaration of his Faith, and, like Marcellus two hundred years later, that declaration would probably have taken the form of the Symbol of the Roman Church. To this declaration Tertullian constantly refers, and as Tertullian bears witness to the existence of 'R.', there can be little doubt that he assumes that Marcion accepted 'R.' as representing his belief.

We are of course unable to prove precisely what Articles were contained in 'R.' at that time, but in Marcion's adaptation of Gal. iv. 24-26, for his own peculiar New Testament, we find the words: 'which [covenant] is the mother of us all, which begets us in the holy church which we have acknowledged.' The last word (*repromittere*, *ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι*) is frequently used for the Baptismal Confession, and the phrase 'the holy church' seems therefore to have been in 'R.' at this date, as we know it was later. But this Article, 'The holy church,' was probably one of the later additions to the Creed; and if it was in the Creed in Marcion's time, the inference is that the Creed itself in its original form must have been considerably older.

From this and other evidence Harnack would trace 'R.' in its earliest form to about the year 140, though he admits it may have been earlier. Kattenbusch and others, with whom Burn agrees, would place it about the year 100, while Zahn apparently considers it to be some years earlier still. He says: 'All these things make it appear not improbable that the recension of the baptismal Creed, to which all the later forms refer as to a common root, must have proceeded from the Capital of the Empire in the interval between the years 90-120.'[1] Here Zahn is speaking only of the 'recension,' but a few pages further on he says: 'Out

[1] Zahn, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 93.

of the baptismal formula grew a baptismal confession which had already assumed a more or less stereotyped form in early Apostolic times. At a somewhat later period, somewhere between 70-120, the original formula, which reminds us of the Jewish origin of Christianity, was reconstructed.'[1]

VI. We have thus far assumed from the simple character of 'R.' that it was compiled before the arrival of Valentinus and Marcion at Rome, and so at one step have thrown back its date one hundred years. We are not, however, left without corroborative evidence of the accuracy of our assumption in the works of Christian writers during this period. The two most important are Tertullian and Irenæus.

(i) In the writings of Tertullian we find many references to the Creed, more than we can here take note of.[2] Tertullian bears witness to the agreement of the African Church with the Church of Rome in matters of Faith. He calls the Creed of the African Church a 'Watchword' (*Tessera*). He shows that it agrees with that of Rome, from which he quotes the words 'Christ Jesus' in the order found in Marcellus. He regards the Creed as a summary of Apostolic teaching, and frequently speaks of it as the 'Rule of Faith,' and also calls it a 'Sacrament' or Oath of Allegiance as connected with Baptism.[3]

Tertullian was born at Carthage and converted to Christianity about the year 192, and became a priest of the Church. He lapsed into the Montanist heresy about 203, and died somewhere between 220-240, the later date being the more probable. Although many of his treatises were written after his lapse into

[1] Zahn, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 97.

[2] Cf. Creeds of Tertullian, Appendix A, p. 292.

[3] 'Uocati sumus ad militiam Dei uiui iam tunc, cum in sacramenti uerba respondimus.'—*Ad Martyres*, 3. Migne, *P. L.* i. col. 624.

Montanism, they are of great value as a witness to the fact that the Creed of the African Church agreed with that of Rome, and as containing many allusions to it. So that Dr. Zahn considers that nearly all the Articles of 'R.' can be found in the writings of Tertullian.

(ii) Irenæus was a native of Asia Minor, and in early youth had seen and heard Bishop Polycarp of Smyrna. He afterwards went into Gaul, and during the persecution in 177 carried, as presbyter of Lyons, a letter from the Gallican confessors to the Roman Bishop Eleutherus. After the death of Bishop Pothinus of Lyons he became his successor. He was still exercising his Episcopal office at the time of Bishop Victor of Rome, and S. Jerome speaks of him as having flourished in the reign of the Emperor Commodus, 180-192. His death is generally assigned to the year 202 or 203. His chief work was five books against Gnosticism, probably written between the years 180-185.

Irenæus is by far the most important of the witnesses to the Creed in the second century, and has this peculiarity, that he himself serves as a link to connect the Creeds of the East and West together. He had himself been brought up as a Christian in Smyrna, and so would doubtless have been familiar with the Baptismal Symbol of that Church, if it had one at so early a date (which Harnack and Kattenbusch doubt). On the other hand there is some reason for thinking that he was at Rome before his missionary work in Gaul, perhaps about the year 156, and he certainly was there in 177; and in the dispute about keeping Easter we find him taking the Roman side of the question as against the Eastern.

There are three passages in his work against Gnosticism which seem to contain notices of the Creed.[1] In the first of these he speaks of the 'Rule of Truth'

[1] Cf. Creeds of S. Irenæus, Appendix A, p. 291.

(Κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας) which the orthodox Christian had received at Baptism and still kept whole and undefiled. The summary of Christian doctrine which he then proceeds to deliver is obviously meant to be that Rule. In substance it was, as he expressly asserts, the one Faith which was professed throughout the whole Church, in form probably shaped according to the type which prevailed in the Church in Gaul. None of the three passages, however, can be considered as containing the precise and complete form; but portions of the actual Creed, and expressed probably in its very words, seem to be incorporated into his text.

A reference to these three Creed-forms convinces one that 'R.', or something very like 'R.', was known in Gaul in the time of Irenæus. We say 'something very like "R."' since there are some four or five of the characteristic peculiarities of later Eastern Creeds, which would lead us to suppose either that he had introduced them into Gaul from his own Baptismal Creed, or that they had been introduced into Gaul from the East before he became Bishop. There is one clause, however, which exhibits a striking connection with 'R.': the order of words in the second Article, 'Christ Jesus' instead of the Eastern 'Jesus Christ.'

(iii) Justin Martyr, a native of Palestine, probably baptized at Ephesus about the year 130, who taught both in Ephesus and Rome, and suffered martyrdom (*c.* 165), was the author of two Apologies and a work entitled *A Dialogue with Tryphon the Jew.* An examination of these works leads Kattenbusch to the conclusion that Justin was acquainted with 'R.',[1] and that he taught in Rome. This is quite possible and even probable, and there are some interesting coincidences of language.

Zahn lays great stress on the fact that S. Justin says three or four times that the Christians in Rome

[1] Kattenbusch, ii. p. 289, n.

and the whole world have healed and still heal many people possessed with evil spirits with the adjuration, 'By the name of Jesus Christ, the Crucified under Pontius Pilate.'[1]

Zahn adds that 'Unless we are willing to adopt the inconceivable view that the sentence which we are considering in all the Baptismal Creeds of Tertullian and S. Irenæus was derived from the anathema of S. Justin's time, then we must allow on the other hand that the anathema was derived from the Baptismal Confession in use in the time of S. Justin.' He adds: 'This application of a sentence of the Baptismal Confession in the so-called exorcisms, and indeed the regular application of it, "in the whole world and in Rome," presupposes that the Baptismal Confession, of which the sentence in question forms a constituent part, must have been everywhere for a long time, and therefore must have originated long before the middle of the second century.'[2] Other writers, however, fail to recognise in Justin Martyr any *direct* evidence of a Creed.

(iv) There are some passages in S. Ignatius of great interest which Zahn considers bear considerable resemblance to the free representations of the Baptismal Creed in S. Irenæus and Tertullian.[3]

Here we may bring to a close the first part of our task, the tracing of 'R.' from its fuller expression in the Epistle of Marcellus back to its earliest source. This we find to have been somewhere about the year 100.

At this point we may ask in what language was 'R.' originally written? There is a practical consensus of opinion that it was written in Greek, and that the early Church in Rome used Greek in her Liturgies.

[1] *Apol.* ii. 6. Migne, *P. G.* vi. col. 453. Cf. also *Dial.* 76 et 85. Migne, *P. G.* col. 653 et 676.
[2] Zahn, *The Apostles' Creed*, pp. 71-73.
[3] Zahn, pp. 87-91.

Some of the Latin MSS.[1] in using participles, *e.g.* 'natum,' 'crucifixum,' 'resuscitatum,' 'receptum,' 'sedentem,' 'venturum,' instead of the relative construction 'qui natus est . . . crucifixus,' etc., are evidently literal renderings from a Greek text. We shall leave to a future chapter to discuss the important question whether 'R.' was, as Kattenbusch supposes, the work of an individual (that is, composed by some prominent member of the Roman Church, either bishop or prophet), or whether it was itself the offspring of a still earlier original Creed which was the parent of two children, 'R.' in the West, and a similar though not identical sister-Creed in the East.

[1] *E.g.* Tert., *De uirg. uel.* c. i. Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 889.

CHAPTER III

THE GROWTH OF THE APOSTLES' CREED

STARTING from 'R.' as contained in the Epistle of Marcellus, we have traced back the Creed as far as we are able, and have found unmistakable indications of its existence about the year 100. But 'R.,' while complete in itself and containing all the twelve Articles of the Creed, falls short of the Apostles' Creed as it now stands in our service-books; and in the present chapter we must trace the growth of 'R.' until it reaches its full development in 'T.'; that is, we have to trace the growth of the Creed from the form found in the Epistle of Marcellus to the complete form which, as we have observed, appears first in the writings of Pirminius.

In this period, which extends from the middle of the fourth century to the middle of the eighth, our material is most abundant, for when Christianity became the religion of the Roman Empire the need for secrecy passed away, and the 'disciplina arcani' was gradually relaxed; only gradually, since we find it enforced both by S. Ambrose and S. Augustine.

With its passing, however, manuscripts containing the Creed in full were multiplied. Of which four types can be readily distinguished, viz. the Italian, the African, the Gallican (which includes the Irish), and the Spanish, the last two being so closely allied as to be counted as one by Kattenbusch.[1]

[1] Kattenbusch, i. pp. 189 and 194.

If indeed we take the whole period which we have to review, the number of Creed-forms found in different writers and representing the Creeds of various localities are so numerous that it is quite beyond the scope of this volume to examine them at all in detail. We must therefore refer the reader to some of the more important types given in the Appendix, and for further study send him to the works of Caspari and Hahn.[1]

We shall therefore confine ourselves (1) to noting the principal points of difference between the Western and Eastern types of the Creed, (2) and then we shall briefly trace the history of the various Articles which go to make up the Apostles' Creed as we now have it.

I. In the first half of the fourth century, while neither the Western nor the Eastern Creeds had attained their complete form, yet both had reached that fixity of type which they have ever retained; so that, taking 'R.' as the representative Western Creed, and for the type of the Eastern, the Creed of Nicæa, and the Creed of Jerusalem as reconstructed from the catechetical lectures of S. Cyril, and using 'R.' as the *basis* of our comparison, that is, disregarding the additions found in the Eastern Creeds, we notice that the chief points of difference are four:

(i) The use of the plural form in the Eastern: 'We believe' (πιστεύομεν) instead of 'I believe' (πιστεύω), as found in 'R.'

(ii) In the first and second Articles the insertion in the Eastern Creeds of 'one' (ἕνα) before 'God' and 'Lord Jesus Christ.' Zahn, however, as we shall see, thinks that 'one' was present in the very earliest form of 'R,' at least in the first Article.

[1] The English reader will find a very satisfactory though brief discussion of the history and value of these various Creeds in the Rev. A. E. Burn's work, *An Introduction to the Creeds* (Methuen).

(iii) In the first article the clause 'Maker of heaven and earth' (*ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς* in the Creed of Jerusalem in S. Cyril's exposition), which afterwards was introduced into the Apostles' Creed, but which is wanting in 'R.'; and

(iv) In the twelfth Article the clause 'Life Everlasting' (*Ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, Marcellus; *καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, Jerusalem, S. Cyril) or its equivalent, 'Life of the world to come' (*Ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*, Nicено-Constantinopolitan), which, while found in the Creed of Marcellus, seems to have been added by a copyist, since it is absent from 'R.' as given us by Rufinus and in other early forms of 'R.', though it is found in the African Creed of S. Cyprian.

Our purpose in drawing attention to these four points of difference between the Eastern and the Western Creeds is that we may recognise an ultimate Eastern source for the two last, which found their way into the Apostles' Creed.

II. The History of the various Articles which make up the full Apostles' Creed.

A comparison of 'R.', as found in the Epistle of Marcellus, with 'T.', as it appears first in the writings of Pirminius, shows that in the latter the following words and clauses have been inserted:

(i) In Article I. the word 'Father' and the clause 'Maker of heaven and earth.'

(ii) In Article III. the word 'conceived.'

(iii) In Article IV. the words 'suffered' and 'dead.'

(iv) In Article VII. the words 'God' and 'Almighty' in the clause 'on the right hand of [God] the Father [Almighty].'

(v) In Article IX. the word 'Catholic' before 'Church,' and the clause 'the Communion of Saints.'

(vi) And in Article XII. the clause 'and the Life Everlasting.'

While our task will be specially to point out the earliest appearance of these clauses in the Creeds of various Churches and individual writers which are later than the time of Marcellus, we shall also, in passing, briefly indicate the earliest known writers in which the other clauses of 'R.' may first be recognised.

Article I.

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.

Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Creatorem Cœli et Terræ.

i. The first clause, 'I believe in God the Father Almighty,' is common to all Creeds from the very earliest days, but there are two interesting questions connected with it which we may briefly notice in this place.

1. As we have pointed out, the Eastern Creeds are characterised by an explicit assertion of the unity of the Godhead. They all begin, 'We believe in *one* God.' And Zahn is of opinion that the word 'unum' was originally in 'R.', and was removed in the very early years of the third century on account of the Monarchianists, who so greatly troubled the Church in Rome. His principal argument for this is, that these heretics accused the Roman Church under Pope Zephyrinus (119-217) of having recoined the truth like forgers.[1] The accusation was made later than the time of Zephyrinus, but the facts which, in Zahn's judgment, seem to have justified it are the traces which exist of 'unum' in the Creeds of the African and South Gallican Churches.

It is certain that the African Church received her

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. xxviii. Migne, *P. G.* xx. col. 512.

Creed direct from Rome, and there are indications that in the time of Tertullian its first Article read, 'Credo in unum Deum.'[1]

The Church in Southern Gaul, on the other hand, may be considered as originally a spiritual colony of the Churches of Ephesus and Smyrna. They, therefore, probably received their baptismal confession, not from Rome, but from Asia Minor; and this accounts for the fact that in the Creed-forms found in the writings of S. Irenæus we recognise the peculiar characteristics of Eastern Creeds.

The Churches of Lyons and Vienne, however, kept up a constant ecclesiastical intercourse with Rome and fostered this connection; and, though S. Irenæus has characteristic Eastern features in his Creed, there are also some Western, such as the occurrence in three well-attested places of the order 'Christ Jesus' for 'Jesus Christ.' But in S. Irenæus we invariably find the phrase 'One God the Father Almighty.' We find, too, in the work of S. Hippolytus against Noetus that the presbyters of Smyrna, in setting forth their Creed, also use the expression 'One God.'[2]

Further, the agreement of the two Churches of

[1] *E.g.* We find in Tertullian, 'Credendi scilicet in *unicum* deum omnipotentem, mundi conditorem.'—*De Uirg. Uel.* 1. Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 889.

'Regula est autem fidei . . . qua creditur *unum* omnino deum esse.'—*De Præscr.* 13. Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 25.

'*Unum* deum nouit, creatorem uniuersitatis.'—*De Præscr.* 36 Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 49.

'*Unicum* quidem deum credimus, sub hac tamen dispensatione . . ut *unici* dei sit et filius sermo ipsius.'—*Adv. Prax.* 2. Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 156.

'*Unicum* dominum uindicat, omnipotentem mundi conditorem.'—*Adv. Prax.* 3. Migne, *P. L.* ii. 154.

[2] Καὶ ἡμεῖς ἕνα θεὸν οἴδαμεν ἀληθῶς· οἴδαμεν τὸν Υἱὸν παθόντα, καθὼς ἔπαθεν, ἀποθανόντα καθὼς ἀπέθανεν, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ὄντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· καὶ ταῦτα λέγομεν ἃ ἐμάθομεν.—S. Hippol., *Contra Noet.* i.; ed. Routh *Scrip. Eccl.* p. 50; cf. *ibid.* p. 75. Migne, *P. G.* x. col. 804, 805

Lyons and Carthage in regard to the use of 'unum' in the first Article of the Creed can be traced later in the Creed of Bishop Dionysius of Rome, which dates from about the year 259.[1]

Zahn's argument may therefore be summed up thus: We have no direct testimony in regard to the precise wording of the first Article of 'R.' earlier than the time of Marcellus. In the Creed of S. Cyprian (248-258) 'unum' does not appear in the first Article. In the Creeds of Tertullian and of S. Irenæus (180-210), *i.e.* of the Churches of Africa and of Gaul, 'unum' is found in this Article. It is also implied in the later Creed of Dionysius as quoted by S. Athanasius. Hence Zahn contends that we must either believe that it was in the original Roman Creed and was removed on account of the troubles at Rome with the Monarchianists, or we must believe, what he considers to be incredible, that the African Church, which had received the Creed from Rome, and in the first period of her existence had confessed with the Roman Church 'I believe in God the Father Almighty' only, had later in Tertullian's time, with the Churches of Lyons and Smyrna, changed this into 'I believe in *one* God the Father Almighty,' and that, finally, before S. Cyprian's time and for ever after, she had returned to the first form. We give Zahn's argument (which is accepted by Mr. Burn) on account of its intrinsic interest, although it has by no means found favour with the majority of theologians.

2. Zahn further questions whether the name the 'Father' was in the first Article of the earliest form of the Creed, or, indeed, before the year 210. As we have observed, it is omitted by Marcellus, though this may have been through the carelessness of the scribe. But Zahn points out between the years 180-210 certain passages which seem to refer to the Creed: eleven in

[1] See Appendix A, p. 293.

Irenæus,[1] four in Tertullian,[2] and the passage already quoted from Hippolytus in regard to the Church in Smyrna.[3] Of these he shows that only two (the two first quoted below from Irenæus) contained the name the 'Father,' and he argues that if *πατέρα* between the words *θεὸν παντοκράτορα* was in the Creeds of Irenæus and Tertullian, its omission is inexplicable, since it would have been invaluable in their arguments against the Patripassians, and indeed he thinks that it was on this account that it was inserted.

His strongest point is that 'God Almighty' (*Θεὸς παντοκράτωρ*) is a Biblical expression, found also in the First Epistle of S. Clement to the Corinthians, in Hermas, S. Polycarp, and S. Justin Martyr. On the other hand his argument is much weakened by the fact that in Article VII., 'and sitteth on the right hand of [God] the Father [Almighty],' the name 'Father' could be used against the Patripassians just as well as if it were in Article I.

3. The Creed of Aquileia in the time of Rufinus, who was baptized in 370, contained 'invisibilem et impassibilem' as well as 'omnipotentem.' Rufinus tells us it was introduced against the Patripassian heresy. These words, however, did not long retain their place in the Aquileian Creed.

ii. 'Creator of heaven and earth.'

'Creatorem cœli et terræ.'

This clause, which is a characteristic feature of Eastern Creeds, did not find its way into the Apostles' Creed till about the close of the seventh century,

[1] S. Iren., *θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα*, I. iii. 6; I. x. 1; I. ix. 2; I. xvi. 3; I. xxii. 1; III. iii. 3; III. xi. 1; IV. xxxiii. 7; in unum deum, III. iv. 2; Solus et uerus deus, III. vi. 4; unum et uerum deum, IV. i. 1. Migne, *P. G.* vii., *passim.*

[2] Tert., *Uirg. Uel.* 1; *De Præscr.* 13; *ibid.* 36; *Ad Prax.* 2; *ibid.* 3. Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 889, 25, 49, 156, 158.

[3] S. Hippol., *Contra Noet.* 1; ed. Routh, *Scrip. Eccl.* p. 50; cf. *ibid.* p. 75; cf. p. 35.

although its equivalent appears sporadically in the Creeds of Tertullian[1] and of Irenæus.[2] It does not, however, occur again in any Western Creed till *c.* 700,[3] when it seems to have been adopted from the so-called Constantinopolitan Creed, although we find writers on the Creed treating the word 'Omnipotentem' as implying the creation of the world.[4]

Article II.

And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord.
Et in Jesum Christum, Filium ejus; unicum Dominum nostrum.

With some slight verbal differences this Article is found in the earliest Creeds. In 'R.' the order of the words is always 'Christ Jesus' (the Eastern Creeds having 'Jesus Christ').

In the Creed of Marcellus, and indeed in all Greek Creeds, the word 'only' (*unicum*) is rendered by 'the only begotten' (*τὸν μονογενῆ*). We shall remember, too, that the Baptismal Creed of the Church of England has 'only-begotten.' In Latin Creeds we sometimes find 'unigenitum'[5] instead of 'unicum.' This is distinctly Johannine,[6] and is a recognition that our

[1] Tert. Mundi conditorem *De Uirg. Uel.* 1, and *De Præscr.* xiii.; Creatorem uniuersitatis *De Præscr.* 36. Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 889, 25, 49.

[2] S. Iren., *Contra Hæres.* I. x. 1: *τὸν πεποιηκότα τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς.* Migne, *P. G.* vii. col. 550.

[3] Mr. Burn includes these words in his reconstruction of the Creed of Nicetas of Remesiana, but neither Caspari, Hahn, or Kattenbusch recognise them as in it. Cf. Burn, *An Introduction*, etc., pp. 254, 255.

[4] *E.g.* 'Non enim aliquid esse potest, cujus Creator non esset, cum esset omnipotens.'—S. Aug., *De Fide et Symbolo*, ii. 2. Migne, *P. L.* xl. col. 182.

[5] *E.g.* In the Creed of S. Cyprian, Bishop of Toulon (*c.* 594). Cf. Appendix A, p. 298.

[6] Cf. S. John i. 14-18; iii. 16-18; 1 S. John iv. 1-9.

Lord is the Son of God in a peculiar and unique manner.

Some few unimportant Creeds add 'Deum'[1] to 'Dominum.'

Article III.

Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.

Qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Virgine.

This form of the Article, *i.e.* with the word 'conceived,' is first found in a sermon attributed to S. Augustine (Sermon 213), and then in the Creed of Faustus of Riez. Even as late as the time of Etherius (785) we find it missing from his Creed. The older form is 'born of the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin Mary' ('natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine'). We also find 'natus est per Spiritum Sanctum ex Maria Virgine.'[2]

Article IV.

Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried.

Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus.

'Suffered' and 'dead' are wanting in the earlier Creeds, the oldest form being 'crucified' and 'buried,' but always with the clause 'under Pontius Pilate.' 'Passus' we find in the Creed-forms of S. Irenæus.[3] And in Tertullian in one Creed we meet with 'suffered,' 'dead and buried,' but without the word 'crucified';

[1] *E.g.* The Creed of Etherius Uxamensis, Bishop of Osma, and of Beatus (785); the Creed in the Sac. Gallicanum (Codex Bobiensis); and that of Novatian (*c.* 260). Cf. Appendix A, p. 299.

[2] S. Aug., *De Fide et Symbolo*, iv. 8; Migne, *P. L.* xl. col. 186; one of the Creeds of the Sac. Gallicanum (Cod. Bob.) has 'natum de Maria Uirgine per Spiritum Sanctum.'

[3] S. Iren., καὶ τὸ πάθος, *Contra Hær.* I. x. 1; et passus sub Pontio Pilato, *ibid.* III. iv. 2. Migne, *P. G.* vii. col. 550 et 856.

in another Creed we find only 'crucified under Pontius Pilate'; in the third, simply 'crucified.'[1]

In the Spanish Creed of Priscillian (*ob.* 385),[2] and in the Creed of Nicetas of Remesiana[3] (*c.* 400), we find both 'suffered' and 'buried.' The so-called Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed has 'crucified,' 'suffered,' and 'buried,' but not 'dead.' The original Nicene Creed summed up all in the one word 'suffered' (*παθόντα*).

Article V.

He descended into hell, and the third day He rose again from the dead.

Descendit ad inferna (inferos); tertia die resurrexit a mortuis.

i. The clause 'He descended into hell' occurs first in the Creed of Aquileia, and Rufinus, in commenting on it, expressly states that it is not found in 'R.' nor in any Eastern Creed. He speaks with some uncertainty in regard to it, but suggests that the thought seems to be contained in the word 'buried.' From this we may infer that he knows nothing of the circumstances of its first appearance in the Creed of Aquileia, and that it had been in that Creed for a sufficiently long period for those circumstances to have been forgotten in his day.

It does not appear to have been indigenous in the Church of the Province of Arles, where so many elements of the Creed can be traced back furthest. It is not found in the Creed of Faustus of Riez,[4] nor of S. Cyprian of Toulon,[5] but it is found in the Creed

[1] Tert., *Adu. Prax.* 2; *De Uirg. Uel.* 1; *De Præscr.* 13. Cf. Appendix A, p. 292.

[2] Cf. Creed of Priscillian, Appendix A, p. 296.

[3] Cf. Creed of Nicetas of Remesiana, Appendix A, p. 295.

[4] Cf. Appendix A, p. 297. [5] Cf. Appendix A, p. 298.

of S. Cæsarius[1] of Arles, and in the Creed of Venantius Fortunatus[2] (*c.* 570) ('ad infernum'). It is also found in the Greek Creeds of three Arian Synods of the fourth century: Sirmium (359), Niké (359), and Constantinople (360). The first of these was drawn up by Mark of Arethusa.

This clause may possibly have been added in early times as a protest against Docetic denials of our Lord's true death; and it is certainly Scriptural, since it is evidently taken from the old Latin and Vulgate renderings of Ps. lv. (liv.) 16,[3] and Ps. xvi. (xv.) 10,[4] quoted by S. Peter: 'Because thou didst not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.'[5]

We find it in the Athanasian Creed under the slightly varied form (which now prevails in the Apostles' Creed)—'descendit ad inferos.'

ii. The third day He rose again from the dead. This clause is of universal occurrence, and with very slight verbal variations. The words 'vivus a mortuis' are found in the Creeds of Martin of Bracara,[6] and in Spanish Creeds (S. Ildefonsus,[7] Etherius and Beatus,[8] Mozarabic liturgy,[9] etc.). 'Reviviscens ex mortuis' is the rendering of the clause in the Syriac *Testamentum*.[10]

Article VI.

He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

Ascendit ad cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris Omnipotentis.

The first clause is found in all Creeds, with only the slight verbal variations of 'in' for 'ad' and 'cœlum'

[1] Cf. Appendix A, p. 297.
[2] Appendix A, p. 299.
[3] 'Descendant in infernum.'
[4] 'Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in inferno.'
[5] Acts ii. 27.
[6] Cf. Appendix A, p. 298.
[7] *Ibid.* p. 298.
[8] *Ibid.* p. 299.
[9] *Ibid.* p. 302.
[10] Kattenbusch, ii. 968.

for 'cœlos,' and in a few Creeds the words 'ascendit Victor.'[1] The latter clause was, however, originally 'sedet ad dexteram Patris,' the words 'Dei' and 'Omnipotentis' having been added later. They seem to appear first in the Spanish Creed of Priscillian[2] (*ob.* 385), then in the Gallican Creeds of Victricius,[3] Bishop of Rouen (409), and of Faustus of Riez (460).[4]

Article VII.

From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.
Inde venturus est, judicare vivos et mortuos.

This Article is met with in all Creeds with but slight verbal variations. Older Creeds (*e.g.* 'R.') have 'whence' (*unde*, ὅθεν), but 'thence' (*inde*) is found in Priscillian and Rufinus.

Article VIII.

I believe in the Holy Ghost.
Credo in Spiritum Sanctum.

This Article forms a part of all Creeds except those which are obviously incomplete, the only variation being the use of the ablative instead of the accusative in some Latin Creeds, *i.e.* 'in Spiritu Sancto' instead of 'in Spiritum Sanctum.' Commentators point out that this is for the purpose of marking the difference between faith in a person of the Godhead and faith in the Church, the Communion of Saints, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting.

[1] E.g. *Miss. Gallic.*, Appendix A, p. 301.
[2] Cf. Creed of Priscillian, Appendix A, p. 296.
[3] Cf. Creed of Victricius, Appendix A, p. 296.
[4] Cf. Creed of Faustus, Appendix A, p. 297. This is the date assigned to Faustus by Harnack, *The Apostles' Creed* (Eng. Trans.), p. 7, though other writers place it somewhat later.

The words 'I believe,' which are repeated from Article I., are also frequently wanting.[1]

Article IX.

The Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints.
Sanctam ecclesiam catholicam, Sanctorum communionem.

I. The clause 'Holy Church' occurs first in the Carthaginian Creed as found in S. Cyprian, but it is implied in the writings of Tertullian,[2] though it does not find a place in any of his three Creed-forms, and in S. Cyprian the Article is found in a different position.[3]

The word 'Catholic' in this Article is of later date. It is found in the Acts of the Martyrdom of S. Calixtus, Pope, and his companions, in the interrogative Creed used at the baptism of Palmatius,[4] the date of which is uncertain, though Heurtley gives it as *c.* 220; otherwise it seems to appear first in the *Explanatio Symboli*[5] of S. Ambrose (*ob.* 397), then in the Creed of Nicetas (*c.* 400), then in one of the six expositions of the Creed by S. Peter Chrysologus, Archbishop of Ravenna (*ob.* 450). However, as it occurs in none of his other five Creeds, and there is no reference to it in the Comment-

[1] *E.g.* in the Creeds of Aquileia, of Venantius Fortunatus, of the *Codex Laudianus*, and in the second Creed of the *Miss. Gallic.*, but they are found in the Creeds of Cæsarius of Arles and of Faustus of Riez. Cf. Appendix A, pp. 295, 301. 297.

[2] 'Cum sub tribus et testatio fidei et sponsio salutis pignerentur, *necessario adjicitur* Ecclesiæ *mentio*; quoniam ubi tres, id est Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesia, quæ trium corpus est.'—Tert., *De Baptismo*, vi. Migne, *P. L.* i. col. 1206.

[3] 'Credis remissionem peccatorum, et vitam æternam, per Sanctam Ecclesiam,' S. Cyp., Ep. lxxvi. 7, *Ad Magn.*; Migne, *P. L.* iii. col. 1144; and 'Credis in vitam æternam, et remissionem peccatorum, per Sanctam Ecclesiam,' Ep. 70, ed. Oxon. *Ad Episcop. Numid.* Migne, *P. L.* iii. col. 1040.

[4] Surius, *Vit. Sanct.* tome x. p. 385. The authenticity of these Acts is more than doubtful.

[5] Cf. Appendix A, p. 295.

ary upon the one in which it does occur, it is somewhat doubtful whether it really belongs to the text. It is found in one of the Aquileian Creeds of uncertain date, and in that of Faustus of Riez,[1] then in the Mozarabic liturgy; but it is absent from some of the pre-Reformation Creeds in England.[2]

It is found, however, almost universally in Eastern Creeds (it is in S. Cyril's Exposition of the Creed of Jerusalem), and was probably adopted into the Apostles' Creed from this source.

II. 'The Communion of Saints.'

This clause was the latest addition to the Creed and is exclusively Western, being found in no Eastern Creed. The words are first met with in the *Explanatio* of Nicetas in the following passage: 'What is the Church but the congregation of all Saints? . . . Believe then that in this one Church you will attain the Communion of Saints.'[3]

It is then found in the Creed of Faustus of Riez.[4] The words are, however, unknown to S. Augustine, for he writes in his *Enchiridion*, 'After the mention of "Holy Church" the "remission of sins" is placed in the order of the Confession.'[5]

One of the most interesting questions in regard to the Creed is connected with this clause 'the Communion of Saints.' Where did it really originate, and with what purpose was it introduced into the Creed?

Harnack in his pamphlet *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss*, published in 1892, connects it with the

[1] Cf. Appendix A, p. 297.

[2] Two MSS. in the British Museum, Nero A. xiv., and Cleop. B. vi.; also in the Bodleian Douce MS. 246.

[3] 'Ergo in hac una Ecclesia crede te communionem consecuturum esse Sanctorum.' Cf. Caspari, *Anecdota*, i. p. 355 et sqq.

[4] Cf. Appendix A, p. 297.

[5] S. Aug., *Enchir.* 64.

controversy in regard to the cultus of the saints. He starts with the fact that the clause seems to appear first in Southern Gaul and Spain, the two countries infected with the heresy of Vigilantius.

Vigilantius was a monk in S. Jerome's Monastery at Bethlehem, but, having left it, he made his way to France, and there preached against the veneration of the relics of the saints, on the ground that the Saints in glory do not pray for the living. S. Jerome combated this doctrine very earnestly in his treatise *Contra Vigilantium*. Now, it was in Southern Gaul and Spain that Vigilantius was most active in teaching his erroneous doctrine that the Saints in glory do not pray for the living, and Harnack thinks it probable that the words 'Communion of Saints' were introduced into the Creed on this account.

In his later work, the Article on the Creed in the third edition of the *Real-Encyclopädie*, he discusses the various theories in regard to it, and suggests its connection through Nicetas indirectly with S. Cyril of Jerusalem. The indirect influence of S. Cyril's Catechetical Lectures, carried (through the Remesiana) into Pannonia and Aquileia, he considers may possibly have reached Gaul.

Peter Abelard, after offering other explanations, suggests that perhaps we may take the word 'Sanctorum' as neuter, and refer it to a Communion in the Eucharist;[1] and a Norman French version of the Creed written at the end of the first quarter of the twelfth century renders the clause 'la communiun des seintes choses.'[2] S. Ivo of Chartres combines this interpretation with that which makes 'Sanctorum' masculine.[3]

[1] P. Abelard, *Expos. in Symb. Ap.*, Migne, *P. L.*, tom. 178, col. 629.

[2] Ms. R. 17 in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge.

[3] 'Id est, ecclesiasticorum sacramentorum ueritatem cui communicauerunt sancti.'—Migne, *P. L.* clii. col. 606.

Zahn adopts Abelard's view, taking 'Sanctorum' as neuter and referring it to participation in holy things offered in sacraments. The majority, however, reject this view, since if 'Communio Sanctorum' is equivalent to *κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων*, 'Sanctorum' must be taken as masculine.[1]

Article X.

The Remission of Sins.
Remissionem peccatorum.

This Article is found in all Creeds with very slight variations. 'Omnium peccatorum' occurs in a few Creeds,[2] in a treatise ascribed to S. Augustine, *De Symbolo*, and in the interrogative Creed used at the baptism of Nemesius and his daughter, from the *Acta of S. Stephen, Pope and Martyr*.[3] We also find in the Creed of the Bangor Antiphonary 'abremissa' or 'abremisa' for 'remissionem,' and three MSS. of the *De Spiritu Sancto* of Faustus of Riez have 'abremissa.'[4]

Article XI.

The Resurrection of the body.
Carnis resurrectionem.

This Article appears first in the Creed of S. Irenæus and in two of the Creeds of Tertullian, though not in this place; for in all three Creeds it is connected with our Lord's second Advent, and therefore comes under Article VII. rather than Article XI. It is found in its right place in S. Cyril's Exposition of the Creed of Jerusalem, and indeed after the second century in every Creed which has come down to us in complete form.

[1] Cf. Dr. Sanday in *Journal of Theological Studies* for October 1901.
[2] *E.g.* the Creed of Etherius Uxamensis, 785. Cf. Appendix A, p. 299.
[3] Baronius, *Annal.* 259. [4] Cf. Appendix A, pp. 297, 301.

We learn from Rufinus that in his day the Creed of Aquileia had added to 'carnis' the intensive pronoun 'hujus.' We may observe, too, that in our translation 'body' has been substituted for 'flesh,' though in the early English Creeds the more accurate translation, 'the resurrection of the flesh,' is always found. In the year 1543 this was altered to 'the resurrection of the body' in the book entitled *The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*, and thus it passed into our English Prayer Book version of the Apostles' Creed, the older translation 'resurrection of the flesh' being retained in the interrogative Creed in the Baptismal Office, and in the Creed used in the Visitation of the Sick.

Article XII.

And the life everlasting.
Vitam æternam.

This Article is found in both the fragments of S. Cyprian's Creeds, but it is lacking in the Creed of Aquileia as given by Rufinus, and therefore by inference from 'R.'; since Rufinus makes no mention of it as present in 'R.' It is, however, found in the Creed of Marcellus[1]—possibly a reminiscence of his Eastern Creed; it is missing in the two later Aquileian Creeds, in the Creed of Maximus of Turin,[2] of Venantius Fortunatus,[3] of the Laudian manuscript,[4] of King Athelstan's Psalter,[5] in the interrogative Creeds of the Gelasian and the Gregorian Sacramentaries, and apparently in S. Jerome's Creed.

It is found, however, in the Creeds of Nicetas[6] and of Cæsarius[7] of Arles, but it can hardly be said to have been established in Western Creeds until the

[1] Cf. Creed of Marcellus, Appendix A, p. 295.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 297. [3] *Ibid.* p. 299. [4] *Ibid.* p. 301.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 301. [6] *Ibid.* p. 295. [7] *Ibid.* p. 297.

middle of the seventh century. The clause is found in Eastern Creeds, *e.g.* in S. Cyril's Exposition of the Creed of Jerusalem, in the words, *καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, however, has *καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*.

CHAPTER IV

PROBLEMS SUGGESTED BY THE HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES' CREED

We have reserved for this chapter several questions of interest in regard to the interpretation of the historical facts which have been set before us in the two previous chapters. A wide difference of opinion exists among scholars on many points, the same evidence being read very diversely, according to the point of view from which its study is approached. Thus there are several theories advanced to account for the historical facts which we have already briefly reviewed.

I. The questions of greatest importance, and indeed of fascinating interest, are—What relationship exists between Eastern and Western Creeds? and have they a common source? According as we take sides on these points will be our interpretation of many subservient details. Roughly speaking, we may divide recent writers into two schools:—

i. The first teaches that 'R.' was the original and parent Creed, not only of all Western Symbols, but also of Eastern Creeds. This school does not recognise any distinctly Eastern Creed before the end of the third century, and considers the Creeds then found to have been developments of 'R.', holding that 'R.' was carried across to Antioch about the time of the settlement of the disputes there in regard to Paul of Samosata (*c.* 272). The principal champions of this view are

Harnack and Kattenbusch, of whom the latter teaches that 'R.' emanated from Rome itself and was the production of one individual author in the Roman Church, who apparently flourished about the close of the first and the beginning of the second century.

This author, Kattenbusch thinks, made use of phrases already existing in Scripture and the Eucharistic liturgy; but he believes that 'R.' was more than a gradual crystallisation of current phrases, that from the first it was a definite creation and product of a single mind, and the expression of an individual conception, or 'Summa' of Christian teaching. Further, he holds it to have been the parent of all other Creeds.[1]

Harnack, on the other hand, does not trace 'R.' back earlier than *c.* 140, and does not insist upon a definite personal author. The two principal arguments on which these writers rely to support their theory that there were no distinctly Eastern Creeds until the end of the third century, and that these were developments of 'R.', are the following :—

1. The absence of documentary evidence for the existence of Eastern Creeds before the close of the third century. This argument, however, is purely negative, and, as Dr. Sanday points out,[2] where there is no literature there can be no literary evidence, and there is very little literature for the whole of Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine between the days of Melito of Sardis and Eusebius, and indeed, with the exception of Alexandria, for the whole Christian East. Hence a negative inference, where no literature exists, is not a very strong argument.

2. The second argument against the existence of a definite Creed-form in the East is derived from the two short Confessions of S. Gregory Thaumaturgus,

[1] Cf. Dr. Sanday's article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for October 1901.

[2] In the *Journal of Theological Studies* for October 1899.

Bishop of Neocæsarea,[1] and of Aphraates the Syrian.[2] These are so entirely unlike any other Creed-forms, so unconventional in their phraseology, that the inference has been deduced that the writers could not have been acquainted with any Eastern Creed, and therefore that in their days no such Creed existed.

It is quite possible that a Syriac writer living, like Aphraates, beyond the Tigris, and scarcely touched by the influence of the Roman world, might have been unacquainted with an Eastern Creed which was known in the great Church centres, just as he seems unacquainted with the Catholic Epistles; but this does not prove that no such Creed existed.

The case of S. Gregory Thaumaturgus, Dr. Sanday would explain rather by the speculative habit of the Eastern mind and its comparative independence of authority. S. Gregory might state theological propositions in regard to the elements of the Faith in his own language, where a Western would simply quote the Creed of his Church. To illustrate this, Dr. Sanday points to this difference in the writings of Origen and Tertullian, and it must be remembered that in his youth S. Gregory had been a disciple of Origen.

We must, however, admit that the statements of faith in S. Gregory and Aphraates are arguments of a positive character, and as such deserve more consideration than the mere negative argument from the absence of evidence in an age which has bequeathed to us such a scanty Christian literature.

3. As against these arguments we should point to the very characteristic Creed-forms apparently brought from the East in the second century and found, for instance, in the Creed of S. Irenæus and in that of the presbyters of Smyrna, quoted in S. Hippolytus. Harnack recognises the force of this argument, and admits that there did exist as far back as the beginning

[1] Cf. Appendix A, p. 294. [2] Cf. Appendix A, p. 294.

of the second century, in the East, a Christological *μάθημα* organically related to the second Article of the Roman Creed, which in its peculiar parts and formula lasted on until it passed into the Oriental Creed of the fourth century; also a formula in regard to the 'One God, Creator of heaven and earth,' and a formula which referred to the Holy Prophetic Spirit. But this admission seems to us practically a surrender of the position that the East had no creeds before the end of the third century.

ii. The second school, which seems to claim the greater number of adherents, among whom we may mention Caspari, Zahn, Loofs, Kunze, and, in England, Dr. Sanday and Mr. Burn, recognises in the East and West two distinct types of Creed, going back as far as it is possible to trace them, and springing from a root itself out of sight. This root Caspari would locate in the East rather than the West, and indeed he suggests that the Creed came to Rome, probably from Ephesus, on the boundary-line of the Apostolic or sub-Apostolic Age, substantially in the form which it has in the old Roman Creed, and that the Johannine Circle at Ephesus may well have been its birthplace.[1]

Zahn, while agreeing in the main with this, would give a somewhat different account of the process. Kattenbusch would prefer as an alternative to Rome, not Ephesus, but Antioch. This choice Dr. Sanday seems to consider worthy of consideration, and observes that it would seem to involve the further alternative that the most primitive form of Creed was rather of the Eastern type than of the Western, which is the conclusion that Caspari also appears to have reached.

II. Having reviewed the two theories as to the

[1] Cf. Caspari, iii. p. 161.

relationship existing between Eastern and Western Creeds, and the ultimate source of both, we shall dismiss further consideration of Eastern Creeds in this chapter and turn our attention to the development of 'R.'

i. We have already remarked[1] that Zahn recognises a recension of 'R.' in the first quarter of the second century, at least so far as the removal of the word 'One' and the insertion of the word 'Father' in the first Article, and that this was occasioned by the activity of the Monarchianists and Patripassians in Rome at that date.

ii. A much more important development is that which we traced in the last chapter, the growth of 'R.' (as found in the Epistle of Marcellus, *c.* 341) into 'T.' (as set forth in the Creed of Pirminius, *c.* 750). In regard to this there are two views:—

1. The theory which is held by the great majority, that the development took place in the south of Gaul.

2. And the view held by a very few, that 'R.' was developed into 'T.' at Rome itself.

1. We have already noticed in the history of the different Articles of the Creed that a majority of the words and clauses in our Apostles' Creed which are not found in 'R.' seem to have made their appearance first in the Creeds of Southern Gaul and Spain. An investigation of the forces and conditions at work in Southern Gaul in the fifth and sixth centuries leads us to assign the development of the Creed to two causes: the influence of the celebrated Monastery of Lerins, and the close connection kept up with the East through Milan, Aquileia, and Pannonia.

(*a*) The school of Lerins plays so important a part, not only in the development of the Apostles' Creed, but in the history of the Athanasian Symbol, that

[1] Pp. 34-37.

it will be well to give a short account of its foundation.

Lerins is one of several small, rocky islands off the southern coast of France, nearly opposite Cannes. In the year 410 S. Honoratus landed there and established one of the earliest religious foundations in France. He was a man not only of great force but of extraordinary personal charm, and gifted with unusual discernment of men. He gathered around him a large community, who seem to have been attached to him by ties of more than ordinary affection; and, though he was torn away from his family of monks to become Bishop of Arles in the year 426, yet in the brief period of sixteen years he drew to him men from all quarters of the globe, and had established on sure foundations one of the greatest monastic institutions of the world.

The great Abbey of Lerins, with various vicissitudes, flourished from its foundation in the early years of the fifth century until its suppression in 1788. It produced in the first century of its life S. Hilary of Arles, S. Vincent of Lerins, S. Salvian, S. Eucherius of Lyons, S. Lupus of Troyes, Faustus of Riez, and S. Cæsarius of Arles. It supplied bishops to many Churches, among them Arles, Avignon, Lyons, Vienne, Troyes, Riez, Frejus, Valence, Metz, Nice.

And this points to its chief characteristic, that it was from the very first a seminary and training-school for great bishops and priests, and hence exercised extraordinary influence on the Churches around. Indeed, when Cassian a little more than a decade later founded his great Monastery of S. Victor near Marseilles, he deliberately made this its distinguishing feature, that it aimed at training for the religious life rather than for the priesthood; and in its earlier years he excluded rather than encouraged such studies as prevailed in the school of Lerins.

To Faustus of Riez and to S. Cæsarius of Arles we have already traced some of the earliest appearances of the words and clauses of the Apostles' Creed not found in 'R.' Through them we may trace them back to the school of Lerins, in which they were both educated.

(*b*) But more than this, the Churches of Southern Gaul, and therefore Lerins, seem to have been always more or less in touch with the East.

(1) In the second century this is accounted for most fully by the influence of S. Irenæus, who was himself brought up in the Church of Smyrna.

(2) Two centuries later there seems to have been a wave of Eastern influence through S. Nicetas of Remesiana, in whose Creed we find more than one addition which afterwards appears in the Creeds of Faustus and S. Cæsarius: *e.g.* the word 'Catholic' and the clause 'the Communion of Saints' both appear first in S. Nicetas and then in Faustus, while 'life everlasting' is found in S. Nicetas and then in S. Cæsarius.

Kattenbusch, however, would reverse this order, adopting a suggestion by Kirsch, that the distinctive features in the Creed of S. Nicetas are due rather to a back wave of influence from Gaul. Few, however, follow Kattenbusch in this theory.

2. While the very great majority of writers on the Creed agree in tracing, as we have done, most of the distinctive features in 'T.' to the south of Gaul, and perhaps to the school of Lerins, Ludwig Hahn, in the third edition of the *Bibliothek der Symbole*, sets forth the hypothesis that 'R.' was revised in Rome itself, and that its added clauses spread thence to Gaul. Mr. Burn also champions this theory.[1] At present, however, this view has few supporters.

iii. The additions to 'R.' are practically all found

[1] Cf. Burn, *An Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 221-239.

in various Creeds by the middle of the sixth century, though they are not all found in any one Creed until the time of Pirminius in the middle of the eighth century; and even for some centuries after that date we still find Creeds with clauses omitted. These Creeds evidently trace their pedigree back to ancestors who branched off from the parent stock at an earlier period.

But the form found in Pirminius is the one which prevailed after the eighth century and passed into the service-books of the Church. This may probably be accounted for by the great effort for liturgical uniformity under the Frankish kings. The Roman Office was introduced into England by S. Benedict Biscop, into Rouen by S. Remigius, into Metz by S. Chrodegang; and then King Pepin, extending the reform which had been inaugurated at Metz and Rouen to all the Frankish Churches, commanded all the Frankish bishops to give up the Gallican *Ordo*, to learn the Roman chant, and to celebrate the Divine Office henceforth in conformity with the custom of Rome.[1] We find Pepin's son Charlemagne carrying out his father's work in this direction.[2]

This attempt to enforce liturgical uniformity doubtless contributed greatly to the stereotyping of one form of the Apostles' Creed—that which is used now throughout the whole Western Church in both its Roman and Anglican branches.

[1] Cf. Duchesne, *Origines*, p. 97, and Batiffol, *History of the Roman Breviary*, p. 86 et sqq.

[2] 'Ut cantum Romanum pleniter discant et ordinabiliter per nocturnale vel gradale officium peragatur, secundum quod beatæ memoriæ genitor noster Pippinus rex decertauit ut fieret, quando Gallicanum tulit, ob unanimitatem Apostolicæ sedis et sanctæ Dei ecclesiæ pacificam concordiam.'—Batiffol, p. 88.

CHAPTER V

OUR NICENE CREED

The Creed which is used in the Communion Office of the Church of England is found there without any title, but in the eighth Article of Religion it is spoken of as the Nicene Creed, and this is the name by which it is commonly known, although some, thinking to be more accurate, call it the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. And, until a few years ago, its history, as generally given, was very simple indeed; for we were told that the greater part of the Creed, down to the words 'I believe in the Holy Ghost,' was drawn up at the Council of Nicæa in 325, while the latter clauses, from 'The Lord and Giver of life' down to the end, were added at the first Council of Constantinople in 381 in order to meet the heresies of Macedonius and the Pneumatomachi.

By this simple statement the whole Creed was accounted for, with the exception of the clause 'filioque,' which we were told was added later. Some five-and-twenty years ago, however, this account was called in question, and in the light of renewed investigation it seems very doubtful whether any part of the statement can be accepted as correct.

It is indeed very questionable how far we can term this Creed either 'Nicene' or 'Constantinopolitan' without a good deal of explanation of the sense in which we use these words, since there seems to be little doubt that the Creed, as we have it, is not the

Nicene Creed, and that no part of it was *drawn up* at the Council of Constantinople.

It is difficult to understand how this confusion of names arose, since the evidence has been always accessible and does not depend on any recent discoveries of documents. Some[1] have thought that G. J. Voss is responsible; for in his famous treatise *De Tribus Symbolis* he says that many writers called the Symbol not only 'Constantinopolitan' but also 'Nicene,' and he quotes Peter Lombard, Alexander Alesius, Durandus Mimatensis, and others. But as his earliest authority only carries us back to the middle of the twelfth century, Voss's citations would not prove that the confusion of names was older than this.

In his next article, however, Voss makes the following statement:—

'Moreover, the Synod of Ephesus itself understood it thus when it forbade anything to be added to the Nicene Symbol. It did not therefore mean to condemn the use of the Constantinopolitan Symbol, in which some things had been added to the Nicene by the Fathers of Constantinople, but it included the Constantinopolitan under the name of the Nicene Symbol. For Evagrius sets forth this opinion of the Synod of Ephesus in his Ecclesiastical History, lib II., cap. iv.'

From this passage it would seem that Voss thought that the Council of Ephesus regarded the Constantinopolitan Creed as the Nicene, but, as we shall shortly show, there is not the slightest trace at Ephesus of any knowledge of a Constantinopolitan Creed, and indeed there is much which is inconsistent with such knowledge. It therefore remains for us to see what Evagrius says in the passage to which Voss refers. We find in the portion of the chapter with which we are concerned that Evagrius is treating of the Council

[1] Dr. Lumby's *History of the Creeds*, pp. 107-109.

of Chalcedon, and that there is nothing in it which would justify the assertion of Voss in regard to Ephesus.

It will be best, however, for us briefly to review, at least so far as concerns the Symbols, the four great Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.

In the year 325, under the Emperor Constantine, was held at Nicæa the first great Council of the Church since the days of the Apostles. Its special purpose was to meet and refute the heresy of Arius, and in doing this it drew up the Nicene Creed.

Among the most prominent bishops assembled at Nicæa was Eusebius of Cæsarea, the friend of the Emperor and the leader of the moderate party in the Council. Shortly after the close of the Council he addressed a pastoral epistle[1] to his own diocese to explain his action in accepting and signing the Nicene Creed. In this letter he tells his flock that he had presented to the Council his own Creed (which he gives in full), and that when it was read in the presence of the Emperor it was approved, and that the Emperor urged the other bishops to give their assent to it and to subscribe to its Articles in this very form, with the insertion of the one single word *ὁμοούσιον*.

But, says Eusebius, under the pretext of the addition of *ὁμοούσιον* they made the following writing, *i.e.* the Nicene Creed; and he goes on to say, that, after having satisfied himself by various questions as to the meaning of certain clauses, he had thought it right, for the sake of peace, to give his consent and to subscribe this Creed. There seems little doubt that the Creed which Eusebius put forth was the Creed of his own Church, the Church of Cæsarea, and a comparison of it with

[1] This *Epist. ad Cæsar.* is preserved. Socrates, *H. E.* book i. 8. Migne, *P. G.* lxvii. col. 69.

the Nicene Creed justifies the statement of Eusebius that it was its base.

In the year 381, at the call of the Emperor Theodosius, a Council met in Constantinople under the presidency of Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, to advance the cause of the Nicene Faith over Arianism in the East, and to meet its Pneumatomachian offshoot. We do not possess the Acts of this Council, but we learn what it did from its canons and from certain statements that have come down to us from the Synod held the next year, 382, at Constantinople. In the first canon we read: 'The Confession of Faith of the three hundred and eighteen fathers who were assembled at Nicæa in Bithynia shall not be abolished, but shall remain, and every heresy shall be anathematised.'

In the Synod held the next year at Constantinople we are referred to a 'Tome' which the Œcumenical Council of Constantinople had drawn up the year before; and some have supposed that this 'Tome' contained the Creed as we now have it, that is, with the Articles which followed the Confession of belief in the Holy Ghost, and which were directed against the Macedonians. This is, however, only surmise, and we have no positive evidence that any other Creed was set forth at Constantinople than the Creed of Nicæa, which we are explicitly told was confirmed.

In 431 the third great Council was held at Ephesus for the purpose of refuting Nestorius and his followers. In this Council the Nicene Creed was twice read and confirmed, in the first session and in the sixth session. In this last Charisius of Philadelphia called attention to a Nestorian Creed which was condemned, and produced before the assembled fathers his own Creed, doubtless that of Philadelphia. The Synod ordered that no one should be permitted to subscribe or to compose any other Faith than that which had been defined by the Holy Fathers who were assembled at

Nicæa with the Holy Ghost, and they added the penalties of excommunication and deposition to any who presumed to do so.[1]

Here we would observe simply that at the Council of Ephesus there is not the slightest trace of the Constantinopolitan Creed, and that it is practically excluded by the decree which forbids the putting forth of any other Faith than that of Nicæa. Voss's contention, that the Creed of Constantinople was included under the name of Nicæa, is refuted by the fact that we have the Nicene Creed in full as read at Ephesus, and that it corresponds precisely with that of Nicæa, with the single exception of the insertion of one clause: after 'Ascended into heaven' is interpolated 'And sitteth at the right hand of the Father.'

In the year 451 the fourth Œcumenical Council was held at Chalcedon. In its second session the Nicene Creed was read with the anathema against the Arian heresy, and received with enthusiastic acclamations.[2] Then the Creed of the one hundred and fifty fathers at Constantinople was read and received, but without the enthusiasm which had been manifested in regard to the Nicene.

After this Aetius, Archdeacon of Constantinople, read the letter of Cyril to Nestorius which had been approved at Ephesus, and a subsequent letter to John of Antioch, together with the letter of Pope Leo to Flavian, all of which were accepted as the true Faith.[3]

The fifth session of the Council of Chalcedon was perhaps the most important to Christendom of any conciliar action. In it the definition of the Faith of the Council was drawn up. After referring to the regulations of the Synod of Ephesus, they add: 'We

[1] Cf. Hefele, vol. iii. p. 71 (Eng. Trans.), and Labbé et Cossart, tom. iii. p. 689.

[2] Labbé et Cossart, tom. iv. p. 341.

[3] Hefele, vol. iii. p. 317.

decree that the Confession of the three hundred and eighteen fathers at Nicæa is a light to the right and unblemished Faith, and that that is also valid which was decreed by the one hundred and fifty fathers at Constantinople for the confirmation of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith.'[1]

Then follows a literal insertion of the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds. And after bearing witness to the sufficiency of the Nicene Creed, but of the difficulties which had arisen from heresy, the definition adds—'Therefore the holy, great and Œcumenical Synod decrees that the Faith of the three hundred and eighteen fathers shall remain inviolate, and that the doctrine afterwards promulgated by the one hundred and fifty fathers at Constantinople on account of the Pneumatomachi shall have equal validity, being put forth by them not in order to add to the Creed of Nicæa anything that was lacking, but to make known also in writing their consciousness concerning the Holy Ghost against the denials of his glory.'[2]

Here we have the first distinct mention of the Creed of Constantinople. It occurs twice in the Synod, in the second and in the fifth sessions, and in each case is preceded by the Creed of Nicæa, and followed by the Epistles of Cyril, etc. We would call attention to the fact that the copies of the Creed read and preserved in the second and fifth sessions differ enormously—the earlier one read by Eunomius corresponding with that contained in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus. The one given in the definition differs from this in no less than eight clauses.[3]

To sum up our evidence thus far, we find that the first explicit mention of any Creed having been drawn up at the Council of Constantinople is contained in the

[1] Hefele, vol. iii. p. 346.
[2] Hefele, vol. iii. p. 347, and Labbé et Cossart, tom. iv. 561-565.
[3] Swainson, *The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, pp. 129, 130.

Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, where it is twice asserted that the Creed as we have it now was drawn up by the hundred and fifty fathers at Constantinople, the reason being clearly given in the second place that it was not because the Nicene Creed was lacking that the clauses in regard to the Holy Ghost were added, but to meet the heresies of the Pneumatomachi. The statement that this is the Creed of the hundred and fifty fathers seems to be attributed to Aetius, Archdeacon of Constantinople, and some have thought that it was made by him for political reasons and was untrue.[1] This is, however, difficult to believe in face of the fact that it was received by the whole Council as true. It is also very difficult to reconcile this, not only with the omission of any reference to the Creed in what remains to us of the records of the Council of Constantinople (this might be accounted for by their imperfection), but with the explicit exclusion by the decree of the Council of Ephesus of any other Creed except that of Nicæa, which is given without the Constantinopolitan clauses.

Our difficulty, however, is enormously increased by positive evidence that this Creed was not drawn up at the Council of Constantinople, since we find it quoted in a work by S. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis or Constantia, in Cyprus. This work, entitled *Ancoratus*,[2] gives our present Creed with very slight verbal differences and with the Nicene anathema attached to it. S. Epiphanius more than once indicates the date of his book as 374, so that the Creed was known to him at least seven years before the Council of Constantinople met, and of course it may have been in existence some time before that.

To sum up our investigations thus far, we find that the common account of our Nicene Creed, that it was

[1] Swainson, *The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, pp. 118 and 124.
[2] Epiphan. *Ancoratus*, cxix. Migne, *P. G.* xliii. col. 232.

drawn up at the Council of Nicæa down to the words 'I believe in the Holy Ghost,' and that the Articles which follow this clause were added at the Council of Constantinople, is inconsistent with three well-supported historical facts.

First, that the earlier part of it differs very greatly from the Nicene Creed;

Second, that the whole of it, including, that is, the Articles which were supposed to have been added at Constantinople, was in existence and was well known some years before that Council was called together; and

Third, that, while there is no trace of any such Creed in the very imperfect accounts we have of the Council of Constantinople, there is also no trace of it in the subsequent Council of Ephesus, which excommunicates any one proposing any other Creed than that of Nicæa, and gives the Creed of Nicæa in full.

The second fact, that our Creed was in existence previous to the Council of Constantinople, needs no discussion. The last, that there is no evidence of its recognition by that Council, and positive evidence of its non-recognition by the Council of Ephesus, has been already fully treated.

We have, therefore, now to turn our attention to the first fact, that those Articles of our Creed which cover the same ground as the Nicene Creed differ so greatly from it that it is difficult to believe that it is the source from which they are derived. This can best be shown by a comparison of the two Creeds, which reveals the following discrepancies:

In the first Article the clause 'Maker of heaven and earth' is inserted after the word 'Almighty.'

In the second the clause 'Before all worlds' is inserted after 'begotten,' and the order of words in the whole sentence is changed.

In the next line the very characteristic parenthesis,

'That is of the substance of the Father,' explanatory of the words 'begotten of the Father,' is omitted. This is the more striking because of the importance attached to this clause by Athanasius and his followers.

The next clause, 'God of God,' is also omitted, and the explanatory clause after 'By Whom all things were made,' viz. 'both things in heaven and things in earth,' is also omitted. To the clause 'For our salvation came down' are added the words 'from heaven'; and after 'and was incarnate' is inserted 'of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary.' Before the word 'suffered' is interpolated 'and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate'; and after 'suffered' is inserted 'and was buried.' After 'He rose again the third day' is added 'according to the Scriptures'; and after 'He ascended into heaven' the clause 'and sitteth on the right hand of the Father.'

In the Article referring to our Lord's second coming two additions are found—the word 'again' and 'with glory'—and the whole clause 'Whose Kingdom shall have no end' is inserted. Here of course the parallel ends, since the Nicene Creed stops with the words 'and in the Holy Ghost.' But the three omissions and eleven additions to which we have drawn attention are sufficient to prove the inaccuracy of the statement that the first part of the Creed *as we now have it* was drawn up at the Council of Nicæa.

This, too, is the more evident when we take into consideration the care with which, on more than one occasion, the *ipsissima verba* of the Nicene Creed were insisted on, as for instance, when Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus quoted the words 'was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary' as part of the Nicene Creed, he was immediately corrected by S. Cyril of Alexandria, who quoted the correct form;[1] and again, at the Council of Chalcedon, Diogenes,

[1] S. Cyril Alex., *Adu. Nest.* i. 8. Migne, *P. G.* lxxvi. col. 49.

Bishop of Cyzicus, quoted apparently from the Constantinopolitan Creed, when he accused Eutyches of falsehood in denying that the Faith of the Nicene Council could receive any additions; but the Egyptian Bishops present protested on the ground that Eutyches had correctly quoted the Creed, which to them meant the Creed of Nicæa, and that no addition could be made to it.

If then the Constantinopolitan Creed, so called, is not a recension of the Nicene Creed, from whence was it derived? This question was first answered in 1876 by Dr. Hort in his *Two Dissertations*. He points out that the basis of the Constantinopolitan Creed is the early Creed of the Church of Jerusalem as found in the Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril of Jerusalem. If we compare our Creed with the Jerusalem Creed as reconstructed from S. Cyril's Lectures, we find that the first six lines, ending with 'Begotten of His Father before all worlds,' is taken verbatim from that Creed, with the exception of the words 'very God,' which are reserved for their Nicene place in the next clause but one. Then follows a short extract from the Nicene Creed: 'Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father.' After this comes 'by Whom all things were made,' which is common to the Creeds of Jerusalem and Nicæa. Then the Nicene extract, 'Who for us men and for our salvation came down,' to which is added 'from heaven' (the last phrase being found in the Apostolic Constitutions and in the Cappadocian and Mesopotamian Creeds). After this there is no trace of Nicene influence, and the Jerusalem Creed is followed, except that after 'and was incarnate' is added 'of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary.' After 'crucified' is added 'for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered.' After 'the third day' is added 'according to the Scriptures.'

In the Article which speaks of our Lord's coming with glory to judge the quick and the dead, the word 'again' is inserted. After 'the Holy Ghost' is added 'the Lord and Giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father, Who, with the Father and the Son together, is worshipped and glorified.' 'Who spake by the prophets' is found in the Jerusalem Creed, and 'one Holy Catholic Church,' to which are added the words 'and Apostolic.' The Jerusalem Creed reads 'in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins' where ours has simply 'We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins.' We have 'We look for the resurrection of the dead' where the Jerusalem Creed has 'the resurrection of the flesh.' We read 'life of the world to come' where the Jerusalem Creed has 'life everlasting.'

Our Creed (the so-called Constantinopolitan) is therefore evidently a revision of the Creed of the Church of Jerusalem, and a revision in which only two words are omitted: the word 'Paraclete' after 'the Holy Ghost,' and the word 'repentance' after the word 'baptism.' Otherwise the entire Creed of Jerusalem from beginning to end is reproduced in the Constantinopolitan Creed. The few new clauses in the last part were doubtless added to meet the Pneumatomachian heresy, while the section which is borrowed from the Nicene Creed was added to bring it into agreement with that part of the Creed of Nicæa which had in view the refutation of the heresy of Arius.

In order to show more clearly the disagreement of our Creed with the Nicene, and its agreement with the Creed of Jerusalem, we subjoin in parallel columns our Creed arranged on two bases, first taking the Creed of Nicæa as the base, and then that of Jerusalem. In each case the words in italics are those which are not found respectively in the Creeds of Nicæa and Jerusalem, while the words in brackets are those which have place in the basic Creed, but are not in our own.

THE CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED, WITH THE NICENE CREED AS ITS BASE.

I.—1. We believe in one God the Father Almighty *Maker of heaven and earth,* and of all things visible and invisible.

II.—2. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, Begotten of His (the) Father before all worlds: [that is, of the substance of the Father] [God of God]. Light of Light, very God, of very God, Begotten not made, Being of one substance with the Father, by Whom all things were made [which are in heaven, and which are in earth].

3. Who for us men and for our salvation, came down *from heaven,* and was incarnate *of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary,* and was made man.

4. *And was crucified for us, under Pontius Pilate,* He suffered, *and was buried.*

5. And the third day He rose again, *according to the Scriptures.*

6. And ascended into heaven.

THE CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED, WITH THE EARLIER CREED OF JERUSALEM AS ITS BASE.

I.—1. We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

II.—2. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, Begotten of His (the) Father before all worlds. *Light of Light, very God, of very God, Begotten not made, Being of one substance with the Father,* By Whom all things were made.

3. *Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven*; and was incarnate *of the Holy Ghost, and the Virgin Mary,* and was made man.

4. And was crucified *for us under Pontius Pilate, He suffered,* and was buried.

5. And the third day, He rose again, *according to the Scriptures.*

6. And ascended into heaven.

7. *And sitteth on the right Hand of the Father.*	7. And sitteth on the right hand of the Father.
8. And he shall come *again with glory* to judge the quick and the dead: *Whose kingdom shall have no end.*	8. And he shall come *again* with glory, to judge the quick, and the dead: Whose kingdom shall have no end.
III.—9. And in the Holy Ghost *the Lord and Giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father, Who with the Father, and the Son, together is worshipped, and glorified, Who spake by the prophets.*	III.—9. And in [one] the Holy Ghost [the Paraclete] *the Lord, and Giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father, Who with the Father, and the Son, together, is worshipped, and glorified,* Who spake by the prophets.
10. *In one Holy Catholic, and Apostolic Church.*	10. In one Holy, Catholic, *and Apostolic* Church.
11. *We acknowledge one Baptism, for the remission of sins.*	11. We acknowledge one Baptism [of repentance] for the remission of sins,
12. *We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.*	12. We look for the re-resurrection of the dead, [flesh] and the life of the world to come [everlasting]. Amen.

We may remark that in the Greek the agreement and disagreement of our Creed with these two bases are somewhat more striking, on account of the order of words, than can be represented in English, as will be seen by reference to the original Creeds.[1]

There is yet a further question of interest which may be asked, and we think has been answered, namely, Where, when, and by whom was the recension of the Creed of Jerusalem made which we find in the *Ancoratus*

[1] Cf. Appendix B, pp. 302, 303.

of Epiphanius, and which was quoted at the Council of Chalcedon as the work of the one hundred and fifty fathers at the Council of Constantinople?

Dr. Hort has pointed out that 'The legitimate Bishop of Jerusalem during the whole period within the limits of which the construction of the Creed must of necessity be placed was Cyril, to whose lectures, written in youth, we owe our knowledge of his Church's Creed towards the middle of the fourth century.[1] In his earliest years he associated with men who were commonly regarded as semi-Arians, though later he suffered expulsion from his diocese at the hands of Arians, and he is distinctly stated to have accepted the term ὁμοούσιον. Thus his personal history is in some sort parallel to a transition from the Creed of Jerusalem to that which we call Constantinopolitan.'

Again, if we examine the additions to the Creed of Jerusalem which we have pointed out in the Constantinopolitan Creed, we find many of them in S. Cyril's own lectures, and others taken directly from holy Scripture. As an instance of the first, we may notice his substitution of 'resurrection of the dead' for 'resurrection of the flesh.' This we find constantly in Lecture xviii. 1-21, where he actually says, 'resurrection of the flesh, that is, of the dead.' It is true, however, that 'resurrection of the dead' is also found in the Cappadocian, Mesopotamian, Philadelphian, and Antiochian Creeds.

If then, with Dr. Hort, we accept S. Cyril as the author of the revision, to what period in his life can we assign it? Probably to his return to his diocese after his exile about the year 362. There would then be opportunity, if not need, for some revision of his Church's Creed by adopting at least the term ὁμοούσιον, which proclaimed full communion with the orthodox champions of Nicæa, and the insertion of some other

[1] Hort, *Two Dissertations*, p. 84.

clauses to meet the heresies which threatened his flock.

The explanation suggested by Dr. Hort, that in the Constantinopolitan Creed we have a revision of the Creed of Jerusalem, also enables us to suggest the manner in which S. Epiphanius became acquainted with the Creed which he quotes in his *Ancoratus*. He was himself a native of Palestine, and shows an acquaintance with things which happened at Jerusalem, Eleutheropolis, and Cæsarea. Indeed, he gives a list of the Bishops of Jerusalem, and a few years after writing the *Ancoratus* we find him corresponding with S. Basil about difficulties which had arisen among the monks on the Mount of Olives. We can therefore understand how he probably became acquainted with this Creed.

There is yet one further suggestion, which to some extent enables us to explain the great difficulty, that the Council of Chalcedon speaks of our Creed as the Creed of the one hundred and fifty fathers at Constantinople, whereas we can find no traces of it either in the accounts of that Council or in the *Acts of the Council of Ephesus*. The suggestion is this, that, inasmuch as S. Cyril was prominent in the Council of Constantinople, where it seems probable that charges had been laid against him, either by envoys from his own diocese or by Egyptian bishops, and where, in the triumph of Meletius, Cyril seems to have been vindicated, it is very probable that in order to prove his orthodoxy Cyril produced his own personal Creed, that is, the Creed of his Church, which, nearly twenty years previously, if we are correct in our surmise, he had revised. This Creed, while not adopted as the Creed of the Council, would probably have been accepted as valid, as the Creed of Charisius seems to have been at Ephesus, and as our Creed certainly was at Chalcedon. Hence it may have been copied into some of the lost *Acts of the*

Council of Constantinople, as the Creed of Charisius was into the *Acts of the Council of Ephesus*, and seventy years later may have been quoted in all good faith by Aetius from a copy which he had of the Acts of the Council as the work of the Council itself. This is of course simply surmise, but so far seems to be the only theory which enables us to reconcile the language used by Aetius in the Council of Chalcedon with the fact that our Creed was in existence when Epiphanius wrote his *Ancoratus* seven years before the Council of Constantinople met.

We shall leave to the next chapter the history of our Creed after the Council of Chalcedon.

CHAPTER VI

THE LATER HISTORY OF THE NICENE CREED

In the last chapter we traced the history of the so-called Nicene Creed up to the date of the Council of Chalcedon, and we found that however doubtful its Constantinopolitan authority might be, it certainly received Œcumenical recognition at the Council of Chalcedon. It remains for us to continue its history until we find it commonly used in the liturgies of the Church, and especially to note the additions which it has received since the Council of Chalcedon.

I. For eighty-five years after the Council we find no traces of our Creed. In the year 325 at the Council of Carthage,[1] over which Boniface, Bishop of that See, presided, the Nicene Creed *only* was read and entered among the Acts of the Council, without any reference to the Creed of Constantinople. But in the year 536, at two Councils held respectively at Constantinople[2] and Jerusalem,[3] we find many allusions to the Creed of the one hundred and fifty fathers at Constantinople.

In the fourth session of this Council of Constantinople Anthimus was condemned, although he had pretended that he accepted the holy Synods. In the fifth session a kind of Rule of Faith was read as addressed to the Emperor Justinian.

The chief interest for us in the Synod, however, is

[1] Hefele, vol. iv. p. 141.
[2] Mansi, tom. viii. pp. 963, 1051, 1063, 1066, 1088, 1151.
[3] Labbé et Cossart, tom. v. p. 281.

in the 'Professions of Faith' which are quoted in it from Dalmatia, Syria, Antioch, Constantinople, from Jerusalem, from Tyre, and finally from the Emperor Justinian himself. Among these, that of Antioch recognises only the Creed of Nicæa; that of Constantinople, which is of the year 518, states that the Council of the one hundred and fifty confirmed the Symbol of the three hundred and eighteen, and some Archimandrites used the phrase of the Justinian Codex: 'The Nicene Creed uttered the holy Symbol in which we were baptized, and baptize; the Constantinopolitan Synod confirmed it, that of Ephesus established it, and that of Chalcedon set its seal upon it.'[1]

We find also a reference to it in the fifteenth Epistle of Pope Vigilius; and in the fifth Œcumenical Council (the second Council of Constantinople), in 653, both the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds are quoted in full as found in the *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon.*

II. In the first five centuries of the Church's history there seems to have been no Creed used in the liturgy. Certainly this was the case in the African Church in the days of S. Augustine, for he says to those who are about to be baptized, 'In the Church at the altar the Lord's Prayer is said daily, and the faithful hear it. . . . In the Church among the people ye do not daily hear the Creed.'[2]

So far as we know, its earliest introduction in the East was about the year 471, when Peter Fullo, Patriarch of Antioch, for the first time commanded its use in the Eucharist, and in 510 Timotheus of Constantinople followed his example. Our authority for this statement is the *Ecclesiastical History* of Theodorus Lector, who tells us that both ordered it to

[1] Swainson, pp. 134, 135.

[2] S. Aug., *Serm.* lviii. nn. 12, 13. Migne, *P. L.* xxxviii. col. 399.

be said 'at every synaxis.'[1] Zaccaria[2] doubts whether these orders of heretical bishops were obeyed to any great extent. He believes that the Emperor Justin, 566, was the first who directed that the Creed be generally used in the service. Justin's direction was that in every Catholic Church the Creed of Constantinople should be sung by the people before the Lord's Prayer. It became, however, the custom to sing it before the consecration.[3]

In 589 a third Council of Toledo, to which we shall refer later, ordered the Creed to be recited every Lord's Day in the Holy Office throughout the Churches of Spain and Gallia Narbonensis, according to the form of the Oriental Churches.[4]

So far as we know, this was the first introduction of the Creed into the liturgy of the Western Church, and it was expressly introduced as an antidote to the Arian heresy which infected the Spanish Church, and which was solemnly abjured at that Council. S. Isidore of Seville (*c.* 610) speaks of it as an established custom.[5] Charlemagne seems to have introduced it into the Churches of France, and apparently about the same time it was used in the Roman Church; for Leo III., in a conference with the legates of Charlemagne, referred to a permission which he had given for singing the Creed; and it is mentioned in an *Ordo Romanus* apparently compiled soon after that time, since Amalarius, who flourished between 812 and 836, comments on it, noticing the use of the Creed and justifying it.[6] Æneas of Paris speaks of the whole Gallic Church singing the Creed at Mass on the Lord's Day.[7]

[1] Theod. Lect., *E. H.* tom. ii. pp. 566, 563. Paris, 1673.
[2] Zaccaria, *Bibliotheca Ritualis*, tom. ii. p. 104. Rome, 1781.
[3] Cf. Swainson, p. 133.
[4] Labbé et Cossart, tom. v. p. 1009.
[5] *De Eccles. Off.* lib. i. c. 16. Migne, *P. L.* lxxxiii. col. 753.
[6] Amalar., *Ecloga*, n. 17. Migne, *P. L.* cv. col. 1323.
[7] Æneas, *Adv. Græca.* Migne, *P. L.* cxxi. cap. 93, col. 721.

It, however, seems to have been dropped at Rome for a considerable period and to have been reintroduced by Benedict VIII., 1014, at the request of the Emperor, Henry II.

Berno, Abbot of Richenau, gives us some interesting information in regard to the reason, or perhaps the excuse, why the Creed was not recited in the liturgy at Rome. In speaking of the differences of usage in ecclesiastical matters in the East and West, he says that the Romans up to the time of Henry II., the Emperor, left unsaid the Creed after the Gospel, and that certain Romans, being asked in his presence by the Emperor why they did so, gave the following answer: 'That forsooth the Roman Church had never been tainted with any dregs of heresy, but remained unshaken in the soundness of the Catholic Faith according to the teaching of S. Peter, and so it was more needful for that Symbol to be frequently sung by those who had been tainted by any heresy.'[1] Berno tells us, however, that Benedict yielded to the request of Henry and re-introduced it into the Roman liturgy.

III. The Nicene Creed as we have it in our Prayer Book differs from that of Constantinople by two additions and by one omission. The additions are the clause 'God of God,' and the words 'And the Son,' which latter in the West has been added to the clause 'proceedeth from the Father.' The omission, which is peculiar to the English Prayer Book, is the word 'holy' in the Article 'one holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.' It remains for us, therefore, to investigate these introductions and this omission.

i. By far the most important is the interpolation

[1] Bernonis Augiensis, *Libellus de quibusdam rebus ad missæ officium pertinentibus*. Migne, *P. L.* cxlii. p. 1061. Cf. also Lumby, *The History of the Creeds*, p. 106, and Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, first edition, pp. 232-235.

of the 'filioque' into the Creed, since it has been made the chief excuse, if not reason, for the great schism between the Eastern and Western Churches. We find it first in the canons of the third Council of Toledo, 589, to which we have already referred as introducing the Creed into the liturgy of the Western Church. This Council was convoked by Reccared, King of the Goths, to give solemn effect to the national abjuration of Arianism. The King, addressing the Council, spoke first of his own conversion to the orthodox Faith, and then of his desire to do something for the glory of God in setting forth the true Faith which he had accepted. After anathematising Arius, he declares his adherence to the doctrines set forth by the four great Councils, and quotes a Latin version of the Nicene Creed, and afterwards that of the Creed of Constantinople, but with the words 'et filio' added for the first time (so far at least as we know) to the Article on the procession of the Holy Ghost.

To this was added in the Acts of the Council a tractate on the Council of Chalcedon, and these Acts were subscribed first by the King and his Queen, and then by all the bishops. The Creed thus set forth was received with the greatest joy by the whole Assembly, and apparently without one dissenting voice.

Twenty-three anathemas were drawn up, and to these were added certain disciplinary prescriptions for the regulation of morals, the second of which is as follows: 'In accordance with the proposal of the King, before the Lord's Prayer the Creed of Constantinople shall be sung with clear voice.'[1]

It is very difficult to explain the introduction of the 'filioque.' The majority of writers point to the fact that there was no discussion and that there were no dissentients, from which they draw the inference that the Council were quite unaware that their Creed con-

[1] Hefele, vol. iv. pp. 416-422.

tained anything abnormal, for had they known that they were introducing into it a new clause, 'filioque,' surely there would have been some dissentients, or at least some discussion.

There are others, however, who point to the great emphasis laid upon the double procession of the Holy Ghost, for not only does it appear in the Creed set forth, but it occurs in the address of the King to the Council, in a sort of Confession which he recited, as follows: 'In equal degree must the Holy Ghost be confessed by us, and we must preach that He *proceeds from the Father and the Son*, and is of one substance with the Father and the Son.'

And in the third of the twenty-three anathemas against Arianism and other heresies, which are subjoined to the Acts of the Council, we read: 'If any one does not believe that the Holy Ghost *proceedeth from the Father and the Son*, and is co-eternal with and like unto the Father and the Son, let him be anathema.'[1]

The matter is further complicated by the fact that John, Abbot of Biclaro, who had been made Bishop of Gerona shortly before the Council, had lately returned from Constantinople after a residence of seventeen years. In his Chronicle this John tells us that the custom of reciting the Creed before the Lord's Prayer had been introduced into the Eastern Churches by the younger Justinian (as we have already noted), and it seems probable that the above capitulum was passed under his influence; and the question arises, Could he have been ignorant of the interpolation of the 'filioque'?[2]

The effect of this interpolation in causing a rupture between the Greeks and Latins is said to have commenced at the Council of Gentilly, 767. There we

[1] Hefele, vol. ii. p. 417.
[2] Pusey, *On the Clause 'And the Son,'* p. 184.

read that there was a discussion between the Greeks and Romans as to whether the Holy Ghost so proceeds from the Father as he proceeds from the Son.[1]

The principal agent, however, in stereotyping the use of the 'filioque' in the Creed, seems to have been the King Charlemagne. In a letter addressed by Tarasius of Constantinople to the bishops and clergy of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople, a Creed is given in which we find the following sentence: 'I believe . . . in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father *by* the Son, and Himself both is and is acknowledged as God.'[2]

After the second Council of Nicæa, 787, it appeared that this Confession had met with acceptance from Pope Hadrian, and on this point Charlemagne addressed a remonstrance to the Pope concerning his admission of such erroneous doctrine as that of Tarasius. The Pope replied that it was not only the teaching of Tarasius but of the holy fathers, and quoted from the writings of Athanasius, Eusebius, Hilary, and others.

It is most strange that although the King's letter expressly mentions the Nicene Creed as his authority for the doctrine he is advocating, the Pope does not point out that in the earliest Symbol the procession from the Father *only* is mentioned. The true reading of the Creed was evidently known to those around Charlemagne, for in the Council of Friuli (Forum Julii), 791, the Symbol set forth was the Constantinopolitan in a Latin translation, with the addition of the 'filioque,' which addition was defended in an epistle addressed by Paulinus of Aquileia to the King, giving an accurate history of all that had taken place in the alteration of this much-discussed Article.

Three years later, at the Council of Frankfort, 794, where Charlemagne was present, and the Pope repre-

[1] Mansi, tom. xii. p. 677. [2] Migne, *P. G.* xcviii. col. 1461.

sented by legates, a 'Libellus' of the Italian bishops against Elipandus was read, the Synod having been called for the purpose of condemning his Adoptianist heresy. This Libellus seems to have been the work of Paulinus, and in it the double procession is emphatically stated.

This was followed by a Synodical letter by the Churches of Gaul and Germany to the presidents of the Spanish Churches, stating the decision of the Synod on the point in dispute, after which was given the letter of Charlemagne to Elipandus and the other Spanish bishops.

In this he states that he has sent to Rome and to Britain to summon ecclesiastics to consult on the question, and that he enclosed three Libelli, first the opinion of the Roman See, second of the bishops of the nearer part of Italy, and third of the bishops of Germany, Gaul, Aquitaine, and Britain; and to these he appends his own agreement, giving in it a form of Creed containing the double procession. Its occurrence in a document addressed to the Churches of Spain issuing from a Council, where Germany, Gaul, Italy, and Britain had been represented, proves that the doctrine of the double procession was accepted without question in the Churches of the West.

The next step in our investigation is the dispute to which Eginhard[1] alludes under the date 809. The circumstances were as follows: A certain monk at Jerusalem, of the name of John, assailed some Latin monks on Mount Olivet as heretics, because they introduced the 'filioque' into the Creed. Not only at Jerusalem, but at Bethlehem, on Christmas Day, were they attacked on this subject, and in consequence sent one of their number to Rome to inquire what was right and what they should do.

In their message they ask that Charlemagne be

[1] Eginhard. Migne, *P. L.* civ. col. 472.

informed of their trouble, and state that they have heard the Creed sung with the clause now objected to in the Imperial Chapel, and that the same clause occurs in two works—a Homily of S. Gregory and the Rule of S. Benedict, both of which they had received from the Emperor. They also quote a Dialogue of S. Benedict which the Pope had given them, and the Creed of S. Athanasius, as authorities for the form they were in the habit of using, and they pray the Pope to send them certain directions.

It is stated that the Pope sent them back a form of Creed containing the double procession, but this statement is rendered doubtful by the Pope's subsequent action. The monks had asked that the Emperor be acquainted with their trouble, and so the Pope seems to have communicated with him, with the result that the Emperor assembled a Great Council at Aquis-Grani (Aix-la-Chapelle) for the purpose of discussing the question. The resolution of the Council was in favour of the addition, and an embassy was sent to the Pope to obtain his authority for the insertion of the words obnoxious to the Greeks.

In the course of the discussion with the ambassadors Pope Leo III. admits the truth of the doctrine of the procession from the Son, but draws a distinction between the truth of the doctrine and the impropriety of introducing the 'filioque' into the Creed, pointing out that there were other mysterious truths which it had never been deemed expedient to insert in the Creed, and advises that the clause be expunged from the Creed.

Anastasius, in his *Life of Leo*,[1] tells us that he caused two silver shields inscribed with the Creed, one in Greek, the other in Latin, to be fixed up in S. Peter's; and S. Peter Damian informs us that the Creed to which the Pope desired to give such publicity was that

[1] Anastas. *De vita Leonis*, iii. Migne. *P. L.* cxxviii. col. 1238.

of Constantinople. It seems therefore certain that at that time the Roman Church had not accepted the clause 'filioque,' although it was used in the Churches of Spain, Gaul, and Germany, and was urged by the Emperor Charlemagne.

Fifty years later, however, this policy was reversed, for Nicholas I. (858-867), when he was accused by Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, of corrupting the Nicene Creed by the addition of the 'filioque,' made no attempt to contradict the statement, but, on the contrary, sought aid of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, at whose instigation apparently Ratramn, monk of Corbey, wrote a work against this objection of the Greeks.

Here the history of the introduction of the 'filioque' in the Western Church ends. It has never been accepted by the Easterns, and later it led to the formal breach between the East and West. When in 1439 Eugenius IV. succeeded in getting the Greeks to attend the Council of Florence, although Bessarion was gained over to the Latin side, and exerted his influence to induce his brethren to acknowledge the double procession, yet Mark of Ephesus refused to be won either by entreaties, bribes, or threats; and after the return of the Greeks to Constantinople, what had been done at Florence was repudiated, and to this day the 'filioque' in the Creed remains the great formal obstacle to union with the Greek Church.

ii. The other interpolation in our Creed is the clause 'God of God,' which precedes the words 'Light of Light.' These words are found in the original Creed of Nicæa, but are not found in authentic MSS. of the Constantinopolitan Creed. They were probably introduced into it unintentionally by some scribe from a reminiscence of the old Nicene Creed. The earliest Creed in which we find them is that of the third Council of Toledo, the same Creed in which the 'filioque' first

appeared, and they have gradually been adopted into the Western forms of the Constantinopolitan Creed.

iii. The solitary *omission* from the text of the Constantinopolitan Creed, at the present day, occurs only in the Creed of the English Prayer Book. It is the omission of the word 'holy' in the Article 'I believe in one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.' The usual explanation of this omission is the carelessness of the printer in the first edition of the English Prayer Book of 1549, his error being perpetuated in all subsequent editions of the Book of Common Prayer. It is pointed out that the omission can have no doctrinal significance, since the word 'holy' is found in the corresponding Article of the Apostles' Creed, 'the holy Catholic Church.'

There are, however, reasons for doubting whether this explanation is really as satisfactory as it has generally been supposed to be. In the first place, it is difficult to believe that men who had been in the habit of saying the Latin form of the Nicene Creed should fail to observe the omission of so important an attribute of the Church as 'holy,' and that edition after edition could have been issued in which the mistake was unintentionally perpetuated.

It has been suggested, rather, that it was intentional on the part of the first revisers of the English Prayer Book, for it is well known that they were not content merely to translate slavishly from the Latin Breviary and Missal, but that, where they were able, they referred to what they considered to be ancient documents; and it has been pointed out[1] that in a considerable number of compilations of Acts of Councils which were in circulation in the sixteenth century, from some cause or other, the word 'sanctam' was wanting in this Article of the Creed.

[1] *E.g.* in an article on the Anglican Version of the Nicene Creed in the *Church Quarterly Review* for July 1879.

In 1524 Merlin's edition was published under the title *Tomus Primus Quatuor Conciliorum Generalium, etc., Parisiis.* The Creed appears in this volume three times: in the Acts of the Councils of Constantinople, Chalcedon, and the third Council of Toledo. In every case 'sanctam' is omitted.

In the *Concilia Omnia* of Peter Crabbe (Coloniæ, 1538), two editions of the Constantinopolitan Creed are given in different translations; one has the 'sanctam,' the other has not.

Again, there is Corranza's *Summa Conciliorum*, Venice, 1546, which was probably well known in England on account of the reforming tendencies of Corranza, who professed to have constructed his work after comparisons both of Latin and Greek copies. In the only place in which the Creed is given in full, 'sanctam' is wanting. It is doubtful whether any Greek Acts of Councils were known to the English Reformers, and in Latin manuscript copies the compilation of Isidorus Mercator would be well known, and this repeats the omission of 'sanctam.' Hence it is quite probable that in omitting the word 'holy' the compilers of the Prayer Book thought they were following the best documentary authority.

Attention has also been called to the rather extraordinary coincidence, if it be a coincidence, in the agreement on this and other points of our Creed with that of the third Council of Toledo. Not only is this Creed the first in which the 'filioque' is found, and the first in which 'sanctam' is omitted, but it has other points of resemblance to the Creed in the English Prayer Book. We repeat the words 'I believe' at the beginning of the third section of the Creed before the words 'the Holy Ghost,' that is, we say '*I believe* in the Holy Ghost.' So does the Toletan Creed, except that it uses the plural, 'Credimus et in Spiritum Sanctum.' Other Creeds, as in the Missal,

omit 'Credo.' We have 'the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds.' So, too, the Toletan Creed reads, 'Filium Dei unigenitum ex Patre natum'; but the missal has 'Filium Dei unigenitum, *et* ex Patre natum.'

The only other discrepancy in our version of the Creed is in the clause, 'And He shall come again with glory to judge *both* the quick and the dead,' where the word 'both' is wanting in the original.

CHAPTER VII

THE ATHANASIAN CREED

THE history of the Athanasian Creed has ever been one of the most difficult problems in Patristic history, and it is one in which we are able to record much less advance of late years than in the investigation of the history of the other two Creeds.

Indeed, Waterland in his *Critical History of the Athanasian Creed*, published in 1723, arrives at very much the same conclusions, in regard to its age and the school from which it emanated, as the latest writers among ourselves, Ommaney and Burn, have reached. The proofs adduced in modern books are stronger, because we are able to marshal greater documentary evidence; but the best writers agree in tracing it, as Waterland did, to the first half of the fifth century, to the south of Gaul and the School of Lerins.

Waterland suggested S. Hilary of Arles, the successor of S. Honoratus and second Abbot of Lerins. Burn thinks S. Honoratus himself was the author; while Swainson attributes it to S. Vincent of Lerins; and Kattenbusch would place its origin some ten years earlier. All, however, practically agree as to its date, with the exception of Dom Morin,[1] who assigns it to a century later, and tentatively suggests S. Cæsarius of Arles as its author.

[1] *Le Symbole d'Athanase et son premier Témoin, Saint Césaire d'Arles, par Dom G. Morin*, O. S. B. (*Extrait de la Revue Bénédictine.* Octobre 1901).

In this chapter we shall briefly indicate the most important evidence on which these opinions are based, passing over, however, many matters of detail, for which we refer our readers to the treatises of Burn and Ommaney.

The evidence is naturally of two kinds, external and internal: the evidence of documents in which either the Creed or quotations from it are found, and the evidence which can be deduced from the Creed itself.

I. The external evidence which we have to consider starts in the first half of the ninth century, and may be traced back with more or less clearness to the first half of the fifth; in other words, we have to review a period of about four hundred years.

There is no doubt of the existence of the Athanasian Creed in its complete form [1] as we have it to-day in the first half of the ninth century, for we find many quotations from it in different MSS., as well as copies of the Creed itself.

i. Florus the deacon, in an epistle to Hyldrad the Abbot,[2] tells us that at this period, the early part of the ninth century, Psalters generally contained the Athanasian Creed, together with the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Old and New Testament Canticles, and of this we have evidence in three MS. Psalters now in existence: Athelstan's Psalter in the British Museum; the Utrecht Psalter, which Ussher refers to in his work *De Symbolo Romano* [3] as being in the Cottonian Library, which was lost for a considerable period and rediscovered in the year 1871 in the Utrecht Library; and the Psalter of Lothair at Paris. Together with these we may mention a *Commentary on the Quicunque* in the Library at Orleans, attributed to Theodulf.

[1] For Latin text of Athanasian Creed cf. Appendix C, p. 304.
[2] *Mai Script. Vet. nov. collect.* tom. iii. pp. 251, 255.
[3] Cf. p. 4.

We find, too, quotations from the Athanasian Creed in various authors, *e.g.*

1. Agobard, Bishop of Lyons, quotes verse 2: 'He who does not condescend to read what proceeds from ourselves may rest satisfied with the judgment of the holy fathers here annexed, because the blessed Athanasius says: "Except a man keep the Catholic Faith whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly."'[1]

2. The Latin monks[2] on Mount Olivet, at Jerusalem, in the year 809 wrote to the Pope concerning the dispute which had arisen over the 'filioque,' and in their letter adduced the *Fides S. Athanasii* in support of the double procession.[3]

3. Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, in a work on the procession of the Holy Ghost, written at the command of Charlemagne about the same date, speaks of the 'Quicunque' as the work of S. Athanasius, and from it quotes seven verses (vv. 20-26).

4. Alcuin, a few years earlier, writing on the procession of the Holy Ghost, twice speaks of the Creed as the work of S. Athanasius. In the first place he quotes vv. 20-22, in the second from vv. 7-26.[4]

ii. At this period, too, we find the use of the Athanasian Creed canonically enjoined in episcopal charges.

1. *Capitula Examinationis Generalis*, a series of visitation articles, in the first of which the Athanasian Creed seems to be referred to under the title *Fides Catholica*.

2. *Capitula de doctrina Clericorum*. This contains a list of 'things' which all ecclesiastics are commanded to learn. The first of these is 'Fidem Catholicam Sancti Athanasii et Cætera quæcunque de fide.' Then follows the Apostles' Creed and Lord's Prayer. The

[1] Migne, *P. L.* cv. col. 35.
[2] Cf. p. 80.
[3] Baluzii, *Misc.* tom. ii. p. 84.
[4] Alcuin. Migne, *P. L.* ci. col. 73, 82.

latter of these two documents has been assigned to the year 802. The former may have been a little earlier.[1]

3. *The Capitulare of Hayto*, Bishop of Basle.

In the fourth chapter priests are required to learn by heart the Athanasian Creed and to recite it in the Office of Prime on Sundays.[2]

We may sum up this first stage of our investigation by saying that in the very early years of the ninth century the Athanasian Creed existing in its integrity was well known and was generally believed to be the work of Athanasius; and we may infer from this that it was at this time an ancient Creed. For, as Ommaney points out, this follows not only from the fact that men of learning like Alcuin assign it to the time of Athanasius, which they would not have done had the document been comparatively modern in their days, but that in placing it side by side with the *Te Deum*, the Lord's Prayer, and the Apostles' Creed, they showed their recognition of it as an authority to be appealed to in matters of faith and doctrine, and to be commented on, as it was, for instance, by Theodulf (whose Commentary we have already noticed) and others. From all which it is evident that in the beginning of the ninth century it was regarded as a very ancient document.

iii. In the eighth century we find abundant evidence of the Athanasian Creed.

1. The profession of Faith made by Denebert,[3] 798, at his consecration to the bishopric of Worcester, in which he quotes several verses of the Athanasian Creed, and introduces them by the suggestive words, 'Scriptum est.'

In this century we have four MSS. of the Creed itself, whole or in part.

[1] Both are found in Migne, *P. L.* xcvii. col. 246-249.
[2] Labbé et Cossart, tom. vii. p. 1523.
[3] British Mus., Cleopatra, E. 1.

2. Paris, Bibl. Nat. Latin, 4858, the first eleven verses to 'tres æterni' inclusive. This fragment is found on the last leaf, and the mutilated condition of the MS. suggests that probably it contained originally the whole Creed. In the other three MSS. the whole Creed is contained. Two of them are Psalters, and Psalters of great value.

3. One is in Paris, Bibl. Nat. Latin, 13159.

4. The other is in the Imperial Library at Vienna.

5. The last is in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, O. 212. It came from the Irish Monastery at Bobbio in the north of Italy, and is the earliest MS. of the Creed discovered up to the present time. It was written by an Irish hand, probably in Ireland. Internal evidence shows that it is not an autograph, but a copy of an older MS.[1]

6. We may also notice a MS. of the eighth century: Paris, Bibl. Nat. Latin, 3836. This, however, is not a MS. of the Creed itself, but a part of a sermon in which verses of the Creed (27-34, 36-40) are incorporated, or, rather, a somewhat free reference is made to them. This MS. is generally known as the Treves Fragment, from the introduction, 'Haec inveni Treveris in uno libro scriptum.' As the writer tells us he copied the sermon, and it was probably an old document from which he copied it, it is an independent witness to the fact that sermons were preached on the 'Quicunque' in the seventh century.

iv. Besides these documents, we have several commentaries on the Creed, among which the seven most important are the Bouhier, Oratorian, Paris, Troyes, Orleans, and Stavelot; and that of Fortunatus. Of these the Oratorian[2] is of special interest and importance on

[1] Cf. Ommaney, p. 95.

[2] The Oratorian is contained in a Troyes MS. No. 804. Ommaney calls it 'Oratorian' because the MSS. from which it was printed belonged to the College De l'Oratoire at Troyes.

account of the express testimony which it bears to the antiquity of the Creed. The author says that he had *always* seen it ascribed to S. Athanasius, even in *ancient* manuscripts.[1] This MS. Ommaney assigns to the end of the seventh or beginning of the eighth century, and Burn thinks it was perhaps the lost Commentary of Theodulf.[2]

It may be pointed out that if in all ancient MSS. the Creed is ascribed to S. Athanasius, and by ancient MSS. we understand those which were at least a century old at the time the Commentary was written, then we must allow a considerable period, *before* these ancient MSS. were written, for the tradition that the Creed was the work of S. Athanasius to have spread so far, and to have been so generally accepted as to have found its way into these ancient MSS. Ommaney considers that such an allowance of time would place the original Creed somewhere in the first half of the fifth century.

v. In the seventh century we find evidence of the existence of the 'Quicunque' in the Autun Canon and in that of the sixth Council of Toledo.

1. The Autun Canon is preserved in two ancient collections of Canons known as the Angers and the Herovall Collections. The Angers Collection is the basis of the Herovall, and Ommaney assigns it to the early part of the eighth century. The latest document included in it is that containing the Autun Canons, subscribed by S. Leger, Bishop of Autun, who died 678. The canons in these collections are not arranged chronologically according to the order of the Councils at which they were promulgated, but according to their subject-matter. The first chapter has for its title 'De fide catholica et Symbolo,' and contains

[1] Traditur enim quod a beatissimo Athanasio Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ antestite (*sic*) sit editum: ita namque semper eum uidi prætitulatum etiam in ueteribus codicibus.

[2] Burn, p. 166.

two canons, the first with this title, 'Incipiunt Canones Augustodininsis Hira Prima,' and the canon itself reads: 'If any cleric, priest, deacon or sub-deacon fail to recite correctly the Symbol which the Apostles delivered under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and the faith of S. Athanasius, let him be censured by the Bishop.' The other canon, the thirteenth of Agde, refers to the Traditio Symboli. The dates assigned to this Council of Autun vary from 661 to 677. The middle date assigned to it by Sirmondus, 670, is the one generally received.

2. The fourth Council of Toledo, 633, presided over by S. Isidore, Bishop of Seville, in its first canon quotes freely from the Athanasian Creed. As it does not quote the Creed accurately, some have suggested that both are quoting from a common origin. That this is not the case is indicated by internal evidence in the canon itself, namely, the fact that the clauses of the 'Quicunque' referred to are quoted in their proper sequence of verses. Besides this there are two phrases in the canon which are peculiar to the Creed:

(*a*) The expression 'pro nostra salute,' as connected with the Passion. In the Nicene Creed it is 'propter salutem nostram,' *and* is connected with the Incarnation.

(*b*) The other is the phrase 'descendit ad inferos,' the last word almost peculiar to the 'Quicunque' and the fourth Council of Toledo, for in the Apostles' Creed in the seventh century we have 'in inferna,' 'ad infernum,' and 'ad inferna.' But the only MS. of the Apostles' Creed with 'ad inferos' is the Irish eighth century *Antiphonary of Bangor*, now in the Ambrosian Library at Milan.

vi. In the sixth century we have the 'Epistola Canonica,' which appears to be an episcopal charge containing a collection of canons or capitula which refer to the duties of the clergy. The first of these is

as follows: 'First of all, let all presbyters, deacons or sub-deacons learn by heart (memoriter teneant) the Catholic Faith (fidem catholicam), and if any one neglect to do this, let him abstain from wine for forty days; but if after this abstinence he neglect to commit it to memory, let the sentence be repeated.' The Ballerini assign the Epistola Canonica to the sixth century, and to the north of Italy.[1]

vii. Then we have two sermons on the Apostles' Creed which seem to incorporate phrases of the 'Quicunque.' The first was at one time published among the works of S. Augustine, but is now attributed without doubt to S. Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles (502-542).[2] The other is perhaps a little earlier, and appears in three places to borrow language from the 'Quicunque.'[3]

viii. Lastly, in a fragment on the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, by Avitus, Bishop of Vienne (490-518), written against the Arian King Gundobad, we find the language of the Athanasian Creed in regard to the Holy Ghost quoted as a recognised authority.

In the first passage we find these words: 'Who, we *read*, is neither made nor begotten, nor created'—the words of v. 22 of the Creed; and a little further on: 'We say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son and the Father'; and again, in another fragment of the same book, Avitus refers to some formulated Confession of the Catholic Faith as teaching the doctrine of the double procession in these words: 'Inasmuch as it belonged to the Holy Ghost to proceed from the Father and the Son, the Catholic Faith, even though it may not have persuaded those who deny it, nevertheless does not depart from this in the rule of its teaching.'

[1] Ommaney, pp. 47-52.
[2] S. Aug. Migne, *P. L.* xxxix. col. 2194.
[3] Caspari, *Anecdota*, p. 283.

Burn also points to parallels with vv. 3, 4, and 32.[1]

It would seem almost without doubt that the 'Quicunque' is referred to by Avitus, for the 'filioque' had not been inserted in the Constantinopolitan Creed so early as the beginning of the sixth century, and we know of no other Rule of Faith which contained it, excepting the Athanasian Creed. Here, then, we reach our goal. Avitus, who became Bishop of Vienne in 490, seems to quote from our Creed as a recognised authority, which of course implies that it had already been written and known for some time. For this reason writers like Waterland of old, and in our own day Burn, Ommaney, and Kattenbusch, assign this Creed to the first half of the fifth century, from the external evidence derived from documents which refer to it or quote it.

II. We have now to investigate the internal evidence afforded by the Creed itself. An examination of the terminology of the Creed shows an acquaintance with or relation to the works of S. Augustine and the *Commonitorium* of S. Vincent of Lerins.

i. In the division of the Creed which treats of the Holy Trinity, as well as in that which defines the Incarnation of our Lord, the phrases used bear a strong resemblance to the language of S. Augustine. Waterland[2] has gathered these passages into parallel columns with the corresponding passages in the Athanasian Creed, and finds in the works of S. Augustine parallels for vv. 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 40. Thus, of the forty verses of which the Creed is composed, Waterland has paralleled all but eleven—the omitted verses being 3, 5, 7, 11, 25, 26, 30, 36, 37,

[1] Burn, pp. 150, 151.
[2] Waterland, *Works*, vol. iv. pp. 270-281.

38, and 39. Some of these parallels, too, are extremely close, *e.g.* verses 13, 14, 15, 16, which we subjoin :

ATHANASIAN CREED.	
13. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty.	13. And so the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, the Holy Ghost Almighty.
14. And yet they are not three Almighties, but one Almighty.	14. Nevertheless, they are not three Almighties, but one Almighty. (Aug., *De Trin.* v. viii. 9.)
15. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God.	15. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. (*Ibid.* VIII. i.)
16. And yet they are not three Gods, but one God.	16. And yet, not three Gods, but one God. (*Ibid.* lib. VIII. c. i. 1.) Cf. *Ibid.* lib. v. viii. 9; et *Ibid.* I. v. 8.

It is quite evident from these parallels either that the author of the Creed was very familiar with the writings of S. Augustine and quoted from them, or that S. Augustine was acquainted with the Creed and quoted from it. We believe Kattenbusch is alone in thinking that the latter is not entirely impossible.

Besides the parallels we have pointed out in the doctrinal statements of S. Augustine there is also a somewhat striking parallel in the Article on our Lord's descent. The Athanasian Creed reads 'ad inferos,' which is also found in S. Augustine. We have just noted in connection with the fourth Council of Toledo that 'ad inferos' is not the ordinary Symbolic expression used in the seventh century. There is also in the Creed a remarkable idiomatic use of the verb 'habere' in v. 38, 'Ad cujus adventum omnes homines resurgere *habent*,' which is a distinctly Augustinian idiom. Ommaney

points out that it occurs no less than fourteen times in S. Augustine's sermons alone.

ii. Another writer with whom the author of the Creed seems to have been very familiar is S. Vincent of Lerins. We find parallels in his *Commonitorium* to vv. 3, 4, 5, 29, and 30.

If, then, the author of the Creed was acquainted with the works both of S. Augustine and the *Commonitorium* of S. Vincent, the latter written in the year 434, unless S. Vincent himself were the author of the Creed, this date would seem to be for us the 'terminus a quo.'

There are, however, two more points to be noticed in regard to the internal evidence furnished by the Creed itself.

iii. One of its most striking characteristics is its emphatic witness against Nestorianism. It insists upon the unity of our Lord's Person. This is repeated no less than four times in vv. 32, 33, 34, and 35, and would seem to be directed against the Nestorian heresy, which taught that there were two Christs; for that in Him were two Persons, as well as two natures.

iv. On the other hand, while there are statements which can be used against Eutychianism, *e.g.* vv. 30, 34, and 35, yet the Creed does not bear the marks of being directed against this heresy to the same extent that it is directed against Nestorianism. The very illustration used in v. 35 ('For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one Man, so God and Man is one Christ') is an evidence of this; for while it is found in S. Vincent of Lerins and S. Cyril of Alexandria, used against Nestorianism, and is also found with some slight change of words in S. Augustine, yet it was avoided by Catholic writers, or used with caution, *after the rise of Eutychianism*, on account of the possibility of its misapplication by Eutychians. These last two considerations would lead us to suppose that the

Creed must have been drawn up after the Council of Ephesus, 431, in which Nestorianism was condemned, and before the rise of Eutychianism, which was condemned at Chalcedon in 451.

We may therefore sum up the internal evidence afforded by the Creed by saying that it points to very much the same date as the external evidence of documents in which the Creed was quoted or referred to, namely, the first half of the fifth century. Beyond this all is uncertain, each writer contributing his guess: Harvey suggesting Victricius; Ommaney, Vincentius; Burn, Honoratus; Waterland, Hilary of Arles; and Dom Morin, Cæsarius of Arles.

III. We must not, however, pass over the theories of an altogether opposite school of writers, who assign the Creed to the ninth century and regard it as a composite document. Gerard J. Voss was the first who placed it in the ninth century, but after his controversy with Ussher he retracted the date some two centuries. Among later writers Swainson, who was followed by Lumby, places the date of the Creed in the early half of the ninth century, and considers it to be a composite document made up of two parts: the earlier (vv. 1-26) he regards as an exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, the later (vv. 27-40) as an entirely separate Christological treatise. The arguments for this view are well summed up by Lumby as follows:[1]

i. Before 809 there is no trustworthy notice of any Confession called by the name of S. Athanasius.

ii. Before that date two separate compositions existed which formed the ground-work of the present 'Quicunque.'

iii. That for some time after that date all quotations are made only from the former of these compositions.

[1] Lumby, *History of the Creeds*, p. 259.

iv. That the 'Quicunque' was not known down to 813 to those who are most likely to have heard of it, had it been in existence.

v. That it was found nearly as we use it in 870.

vi. A comparison of the various MSS. shows that after the combination of the two parts the text was for some time in an unsettled or transient state.

These conclusions are of course inconsistent with the authorities we have considered, and they are reached only by disputing the date or authenticity of some of the documents we have quoted, and by explaining away the references to the Creed which we have found in other documents.

Harnack supports a somewhat different two-document theory, recognising, however, that the *first* part emanated from Gaul in the fifth century, but holding that the second part was not added till the ninth century. He considers the origin of this part obscure, though anterior to the ninth century.

Professor Loofs demolishes the two-document theory, but proposes another, that of accretion. He considers that the origin of the 'Quicunque' was a sermon on the Apostles' Creed, which, after passing through many stages, was gradually polished into its present form, after which the name of 'S. Athanasius' was attached to it, but that it reached this completed form prior to the Council of Autun, *i.e.* in the first half of the seventh century. Dr. Loofs' theory has received sufficient answer in Mr. Burn's book.[1]

IV. After the ninth century the Athanasian Creed passed rapidly into the Offices of the Church. Hayto, Bishop of Basle (*c.* 820), imposed upon his clergy not only the obligation of knowing it by heart, but of reciting it every Sunday at Prime; and Batiffol tells us that 'In the eleventh century there was no part of

[1] Pp. 178-181.

the Church north of the Alps where the "Quicunque vult" was not recited at Prime at least every Sunday, and in most Churches not only on Sunday, but at Prime every day.'[1] At this time it was also used in England, but the date at which it obtained recognition in the Office books at Rome is doubtful.

It has never been formally accepted by the Eastern Church, which recognises only one Symbol, that which is called the Nicene Creed. There have been, however, many Greek translations of the Athanasian Creed, and it finds a place in the Greek Horologion Magnum, not, however, as an authoritative Creed of the Church, but as a Confession of great value.

We learn from the writings of Leo Allatius (1659) that in the thirteenth century the Greeks accused the Latins of inserting into the Faith of the holy Athanasius, called the Catholic Faith, the words 'and from the Son,' and it appears that a Greek version of the 'Quicunque' which did not contain this clause was known about the year 1200.

In England, before the Reformation, as evidenced by the *Primer* put forth by Hilsey, Bishop of Rochester (1539), the Athanasian Creed was said daily in the public service of the Church, a practice which seems to have been peculiar to England. In the first English Prayer Book (1549) this daily recitation was diminished to the six great Festivals of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, and Trinity. In the second Prayer Book of 1552 the seven Feasts of S. Matthias, S. John the Baptist, S. James, S. Bartholomew, S. Matthew, SS. Simon and Jude, and S. Andrew were added; and thus the rubric has remained through all subsequent editions of the Prayer Book, so that the Athanasian Creed is ordered to be recited in the Church of England thirteen times a year.

[1] Batiffol, *History of the Roman Breviary*, p. 192.

PART II

EXPOSITION

CHAPTER I

ARTICLE I

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.—*Apostles' Creed.*

I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.—*Nicene Creed.*

Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith.

Which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

And the Catholick Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity;

Neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the Substance.

For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son: and another of the Holy Ghost.

But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal.

Such as the Father is, such is the Son: and such is the Holy Ghost.

The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate: and the Holy Ghost uncreate.

The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible: and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible.

The Father eternal, the Son eternal: and the Holy Ghost eternal.

And yet they are not three eternals: but one eternal.

As also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated: but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible.

So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty: and the Holy Ghost Almighty.

And yet they are not three Almighties: but one Almighty.

So the Father is God, the Son is God: and the Holy Ghost is God.

And yet they are not three Gods: but one God.

So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord: and the Holy Ghost Lord.

And yet not three Lords: but one Lord.

For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity: to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord;

So are we forbidden by the Catholick Religion: to say, There be three Gods, or three Lords.

The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten.

The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created, but begotten.

The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, not begotten, but proceeding.

So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons: one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.

And in this Trinity none is afore, or after other: none is greater, or less than another;

But the whole three Persons are co-eternal together: and co-equal.

So that in all things, as is aforesaid: the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped.

He therefore that will be saved: must thus think of the Trinity.—*Athanasian Creed.*

I. Of Faith.

In the first Article of the Creed, or rather of the three Creeds, we have two words, and, if we include the term 'Creed' itself, three, to express our relation toward the subject-matter of revelation which forms the Church's Creed. We say, in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, '*I believe.*' In the Athanasian Creed we say, '*Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith.*' And we call the synopsis of that Faith a Creed. Hence we must begin our dogmatic exposition of the Creeds with an investigation of the precise meaning of the three words, 'belief,' 'faith,' and 'creed.' It is always of advantage to us, as well as a work of interest, to examine the etymon of a word whose exact meaning we are seeking, that we may grasp the idea which lies

at its root. Let us therefore inquire into the derivation of these three words, 'belief,' 'faith,' and 'creed,' before we attempt to define 'faith.'

'Belief' is akin to the German 'glauben.' It comes from the Anglo-Saxon 'geleafa,' which is cognate to the middle low German 'gelove, gelof,' to the middle high German 'geloube,' and to modern German 'Glaube,' which is itself derived from 'galaubs,' dear, valuable. The root is the same as in 'lieben,' to love; 'loben,' to praise; 'geloben,' to promise, or vow; and the underlying idea seems to be that of accepting a thing willingly, and holding it fast approvingly, as something which is valuable.

'Faith' is of course derived from the Latin 'fides,' which is akin to the Greek πίστις, derived from πείθεσθαι; the root-meaning is 'to bind.' Thus the underlying idea here is that of allowing oneself to be persuaded or convinced.

'Creed' comes from the Latin 'credere,' which is akin to the Greek κρατεῖν, derived from the Sanskrit 'krat-dha,' to give trust, to confide; the notion of confidence or trust being predominant in the word 'Creed.' It is evident from this brief consideration of the root-meanings of these words that they do not exclusively refer to acts of the *intellect*, but frequently also to the *affections* and to the *will*.

With these ideas before us, let us attempt to express what we mean by 'faith.'

Faith has been most briefly defined as 'assent on authority,' that is, the acceptance of a proposition as true, not because we perceive its truth, but because we have confidence in the person who tells us it is true. There is also bound up in the idea of faith the further notion that the assent is in itself good and to be desired. Hence faith is not solely an act of the intellect, but an act in which the will has part, for the act of the intellect is induced by the will, the

assent of the intellect to what is *true* in the proposition being determined by the assent of the will to what is *good* in it.[1]

Thus far our definition of faith would apply as much to this virtue in the natural order as in the spiritual. Indeed the natural virtue of faith is one of the most important factors in human conduct, for most of our actions are influenced by natural faith. The child in the process of learning at first accepts everything without question on the authority of its teacher. Afterwards it comes to know the value of that authority and to find out where it perhaps was in error; but learning would be impossible without the exercise of the natural virtue of faith. So, too, the man entering a business or profession has to begin with faith, accepting the experience of others as the basis of his own ventures. Sometimes he finds he was justified in doing so, sometimes the reverse; but while there is always an element of uncertainty in the human testimony which is the authority upon which, in the natural order, faith has to rest, yet life in this world could not go on without it.

If we now turn from the virtue of faith as we find it in the natural order to supernatural or divine faith, to faith, that is, as a theological virtue, we shall find that while, like natural faith, it is 'assent on authority' to truths which we cannot of ourselves know, yet it differs enormously from natural faith in several most important particulars:

1. The *motive* of faith, that is, the authority on which it rests, is altogether different, for instead of being human testimony, which is liable to error, it is the authority of God Himself. Hence the element of uncertainty is eliminated, and divine faith rests upon absolute certitude, upon the authority of God Himself.

2. The *sphere* of supernatural faith is different, for,

[1] Cf. Wilhelm and Scannell, vol. i. pp. 112-114.

instead of being confined to this present life, it is enlarged to comprehend the things of Eternity.

3. In the *subject-matter*, or the *object* of faith, there is again a difference, for, instead of the opinion of men, theological faith has for its object the revelation of God.

4. The *act* of divine faith, too, differs from human faith especially in this, that the authority which exacts it must also make it possible by co-operating in its production. Hence, in addition to the acts of the intellect and will, there must also be the action of divine grace; and this is what we mean when we say that faith is in the first place the gift of God. Grace must enlighten the intellect and inspire the will so as to impart a supernatural character to the act of faith.

From this it follows that there are three subjective causes of faith:

1. The intellect: S. Paul says, 'Now we see through a glass, darkly';[1] but this act of vision certainly refers to knowledge, and therefore to the intellect; for S. Paul goes on to add, 'Now I *know* in part.'

2. The will: For an act of faith is elicited not only by the intellect, but also by the dominion of free will which can command assent or not. This too we learn from Holy Scripture, for we read, 'If thou . . . shalt believe in thine heart . . . for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness.'[2] The word 'heart' as used in Holy Scripture does not designate the seat of the affections as with us (these are spoken of as 'the bowels'[3]), but is often used of the will as the source of action.

3. Grace: An act of faith cannot be perfected without grace, which illuminates the intellect and inspires the will, for we learn from the lips of Christ Himself, 'No man can come to Me, except the Father which

[1] 1 Cor. xiii. 12. [2] Rom. x. 9, 10. [3] Phil i. 8.

hath sent Me draw him.'[1] And S. Paul also teaches us, 'By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.'[2]

Having now some conception of what we mean by the word 'faith,' we must next observe that faith is used in more than one sense. It is used subjectively of the faith *by which* we believe, and objectively of the faith *which* we believe. When we say in the Athanasian Creed 'it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith,' we are using the word 'faith' objectively, and mean by it that which is really the object of faith, the revelation of God.

In its subjective sense, too, we must distinguish between the *act* of faith, by which we believe, and the *virtue* of faith, which enables us to make that act.

Before we proceed to the dogmatic exposition of the faith which is contained in the Creeds, it will be well to draw attention to the principles upon which the doctrines of the Church, that is, the Articles of the Faith, are set forth by the Church.

We have already pointed out that the subject-matter of faith, and therefore of the Creeds, is that which has been revealed by God. But, it may be asked, when, by whom, and to whom was it revealed? And the answer is very simple and explicit: It was revealed on the Day of Pentecost, by the Holy Ghost, to the Holy Apostles, and through them to the Church of Christ. In the Old Testament dispensation, revelation was partial and imperfect, but on the Day of Pentecost was fulfilled our Lord's promise that He would send from the Father 'the Spirit of Truth,'[3] Who should abide with the Church for ever,[4] Who should teach the Church all things,[5] and should guide the Church into all truth.[6]

[1] S. John vi. 44.
[2] Eph. ii. 8.
[3] Cf. S. John xiv. 17; xv. 26; xvi. 13.
[4] S. John xiv. 16.
[5] S. John xiv. 26.
[6] S. John xvi. 13.

This divine revelation given at Pentecost was a sacred 'deposit' which was to be kept intact, for S. Paul solemnly pronounces 'accursed' whoever, whether angel or man, should preach any other gospel;[1] and S. Jude considers it needful for the common salvation to exhort his readers that they 'earnestly contend for the faith which was once [for all, ἅπαξ] delivered unto the saints.'[2]

This deposit was handed down at first orally,[3] then committed to writing; but both the oral and written deposit were the result of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

The revelation once for all given is then the *source* of all the Church's doctrine, and the two concurrent streams are *Tradition* and *Holy Scripture*, the written and unwritten Word of God. Of these Tradition is the older, since it existed before Holy Scripture was written, and indeed is referred to in Holy Scripture: 'Hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our Epistle.'[4] The Church appeals to the Holy Scripture to prove her Tradition, and declares that all things necessary to salvation are contained in, or may be proved from, Holy Scripture.

We must therefore clearly understand that every doctrine of the Church is implicitly contained in the deposit given at Pentecost, and that the Church has no power to add any *new* doctrine. Her work under the promised guidance of the Holy Ghost is to interpret and unfold this revelation once given, as the needs and controversies of the age require. And further, we must remember that 'the Church hath authority in controversies of Faith.'[5]

The Church exercises her teaching office, in unfolding and interpreting the faith once delivered, in two ways:

1. The one extraordinary, which is used only on rare

[1] Cf. Gal. i. 8. [2] Jude 3. [3] 2 Tim. ii. 2.
[4] 2 Thess. ii. 15. [5] Article XX.

occasions and when required by serious necessity, as in an Œcumenical Council, when the Church defines Articles of Faith and puts forth Creeds.

2. The other is her ordinary method of promulgating truth, that is, through the consentient teaching of her pastors and the ordinary practice of the Church itself everywhere.

Hence, in this exposition of the Creeds, our aim must be to bring to bear on the different Articles of the Creed the Church's teaching as gathered from her councils and the writings of her best theologians.

II. Of God.

God is the Supreme Being, without beginning, without end, without cause, absolutely perfect. He is incomprehensible and ineffable, and therefore no human intellect can fully grasp what He is, and no human language can adequately describe Him. Natural religion, however, is sufficient to enable man not only to know of God's existence, but to know much of God Himself, for S. Paul tells us that 'the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead.'[1]

To the Christian, however, there is another channel of knowledge incomparably greater than the evidence of nature or the teachings of natural religion. We mean, of course, the Incarnation, through which God has revealed Himself to man, and has also revealed that to know Him is life eternal.[2]

This knowledge of God which is life eternal, and therefore the knowledge above all things to be desired and sought, does not depend on accurate comprehension of theological propositions in which the nature of

[1] Rom. i. 19, 20. [2] S. John xvii. 3.

God is described, but upon that living faith whereby the most ignorant may know God with the knowledge which our Lord tells us is life eternal.

i. We must not, however, on this account neglect to learn all that we can about God, for a clear grasp of what God is may be of very great value to us in the practical experiences of spiritual life, especially in the two special exigencies of great trial and of earnest prayer.

A great trial or sorrow is a very real testing of our knowledge of God. If we are ignorant of God's real nature, there is the danger of substituting for the God who created us and all other beings, a God who is the creation of our own imagination. How often one, weighed down by crushing sorrow or misfortune, utters the complaint, 'God is cruel in dealing thus with me.'

The frequency with which we see those in trouble rebelling against God is an illustration of the importance of right views about God, for if we believe that God is Love, it is impossible that God can be cruel. We might as well accuse the sun of being the cause of darkness as to accuse God of being cruel. Darkness is caused by the earth turning away from the sun; in light there *can be* no darkness. Suffering is caused by man turning away from God—that is, by sin; not necessarily the sin of the man who suffers, but by the sin which is in the world, and to undo the results of which the Son of God died on the Cross.

If we believe in God's Omniscience, that He knows our trials and sorrows; in God's Omnipotence, that He can help us to the uttermost; and in God's Love—it would be impossible to rebel against God, impossible not to trust God. Rebellion against God implies either ignorance in regard to God's nature or lack of any real belief in God at all.

Again, in that universal necessity of all spiritual life, earnest prayer, a little consideration will show us

that a realisation of the same three attributes, God's Omniscience, Omnipotence, and Love, are the bases of all true prayer.

ii. Our first conception of God is derived from that natural knowledge which, while it falls short of supernatural faith, is often the preparation for it. Creation is a revelation of God, of God's Wisdom and Love and Power. Hence by analogy, and yet most truly, we may hold that the perfections found in creation are a faint reproduction of the perfections of the Creator. Taking this as a basis, theologians teach us that there are three methods by which we may arrive at the natural knowledge of God.

1. The Positive Method, or Way of Causality. From the order and beauty of the world we conclude that the perfections we find in creatures exist in the Creator, and this, aided by God's revelation of Himself in Holy Scripture and through the Incarnation, enables us to know the positive attributes of God.

2. The Negative Method, or Way of Removal. By this we deny that the imperfections which we see in creatures exist in God their Creator; for, since God is pure actuality (using the word 'actuality' as opposed to potentiality), it is impossible to conceive of any imperfection in Him. These negative attributes, which we arrive at by denying the imperfections found in creatures, are the attributes of Simplicity, Immutability, Eternity, Immensity, Infinity, etc.

3. The Method of Excellence, or Way of Eminence. By this we recognise that whatever perfections there are in the creature must exist in the Creator, only in a more exalted manner; so that we say that God is All-Powerful, All-Wise, All-Holy. 'These three methods have been illustrated from the three principal fine arts. The painter produces a picture by transferring colours to the canvas; the sculptor executes a statue by chipping away portions of a block of

marble; while the poet strives to realise his ideal by the aid of metaphor and hyperbole.'[1]

iii. In speaking, however, of God's attributes, we must most carefully bear in mind that for lack of a better term we are using a word which is most misleading when applied to God. The word 'attribute' in ordinary language signifies something added to a person or thing, so that we can conceive of the person or thing apart from the attribute. This, however, is not true of God, since God's attributes are really God's Essence, and God could not part with any attribute without ceasing to be God. For example, if we could think of God laying aside for a period the attribute of Omnipotence or Omniscience, we should have to think of other attributes being thereby destroyed; for if God at one time possessed something which He did not possess at another, He would be more perfect at one time than at the other. Hence we should destroy God's attribute of Perfection. In the same way we should also destroy His attribute of Immutability, for we should be introducing the idea of change into the Godhead. It is important to realise this, because of certain false teaching in regard to our Blessed Lord's kenosis, or self-emptying, which is prevalent among some of the sectarian bodies on the Continent. This is really a revival of an ancient heresy, which in a modified form has been taken up by some teachers in England, though probably it has met with very little general acceptance.

iv. Besides those attributes of God which we can learn from natural religion, revelation tells us much of God's nature, both by the names of God in the Old Testament which reveal certain characteristics of the Godhead, and also by special attributes upon which the writers of the new Testament dwell. For example, S. John tells us that God is Spirit, that God is Light,

[1] Wilhelm and Scannell, *A Manual of Catholic Theology*, p. 166.

and that God is Love; and though we may learn all these three from natural religion, yet the fulness with which S. John treats of these attributes adds much to our knowledge of God. In our Lord's discourse with the woman of Samaria we meet with the first 'God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.'[1] Here we have not only a revelation that God is Spirit, but from this attribute is deduced the true character of religious worship, that it must be spiritual and sincere. In regard to this passage we may observe that the text should not be translated as in our version, 'God is *a* Spirit,' for that would make God one of a class, whereas the expression 'God is Spirit' separates God absolutely from all material limitations.

Again, when S. John says, 'God is Light, and in Him is no darkness at all,'[2] we have an illustration here of the application to God's attributes of all three methods of Causality, Removal, and Eminence; moreover, taken in connection with S. John's treatment of this attribute, we see that it implies self-revelation. Light reveals, and He who is light is self-revealed.

Again, S. John tells us 'God is Love.'[3] We have both the revelation of an attribute and an adumbration of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, for if God is Love He must be a social Being; for as God's attributes are His Essence, and as God is unchangeable, there must always have been an object of His love, before that in the beginning of time God's love overflowed in the work of Creation. Hence S. John's treatment of this attribute (which might have been learned imperfectly from natural religion) helps us to the grasp of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and explains to us the cause of Creation.

v. In proceeding to the consideration of God's attributes, it will be well to investigate which of our

[1] S. John iv. 24. [2] 1 S. John i. 5. [3] 1 S. John iv. 8, 16.

conceptions of God are the most fundamental, and to begin with those.

1. There can be no doubt that our most fundamental conception of God is that which we learn from His revelation to Moses of His name 'Jehovah,' 'I am that I am,' the Self-existent One. The majority of theologians define 'Aseity' or Self-existence as the metaphysical Essence of God. Aseity (from the Latin words *a se*) affirms that God is Self-derived, that He is the Uncaused necessary Being, and in this is involved all else that is true concerning Him.

2. The next most fundamental conception of God is that to which we have already referred as revealed in S. John's Gospel, that 'God is Spirit,' and this involves the two great properties of spirit, Intelligence and Will.

(*a*) The Infinity of God's knowledge we express by the word 'Omniscient,' by which we mean that all objects of knowledge are at all times actually present to God's consciousness; nothing is so minute as to escape His Omniscience; and yet this does not imply the perception of many separate things, but that His Unity enables God to see all things that are or can be in all their relations to each other, actual and possible.

(*b*) The Will of God. We mean by 'will' that faculty which chooses among objects which the intellect brings before it, selecting some and rejecting others. It is also a function of the will to aim at an end and consciously to choose means for its attainment. The primary object of the Will of God is the Divine Essence. Creatures are its secondary object.

In treating of the Will of God Peter Lombard distinguishes between the Will of God's good pleasure, or His secret Will, which is the internal action by which God wills anything, and His revealed Will, by which He shows by some outward indication that He wills

anything. Of these the first is always fulfilled, the latter is sometimes unfulfilled.

The same idea has been otherwise put by S. John Damascene, who distinguishes between the Antecedent and the Consequent Will of God. When God wills anything without regard to circumstances, as, for instance, when He wills all men to be saved, this is the Antecedent Will (*θέλημα*).

When, however, God wills anything with a view to certain circumstances, the contrary whereof He would will, were not the circumstances what they are, as when He wills all men to be saved on condition that they co-operate with His grace, but, this condition being unfulfilled in some, He wills them to be lost—this is His Consequent Will (*βουλή*).

The first or Antecedent will emanates from the goodness of God and is conditional; the second or Consequent Will embraces His Justice as well as His Mercy, taking account of man's free will, and is absolute.

(*c*) Perhaps the next attribute in order of our conception is that of God's Perfection. As God is an absolute Being, so is He also absolutely all that He can or ought to be by His nature. He is therefore essentially perfect, and is self-sufficient for His own Perfection. He possesses in Himself, without any internal evolution or external influence, absolute and entire Perfection, and this Perfection is the principle, the measure, and the object of all other perfections of the creatures, which are indeed perfections only in so far as they resemble and participate in the Divine Perfection.

vi. God's attributes, for convenience of treatment, have been variously arranged, as into positive and negative attributes, physical and moral, communicable and incommunicable, absolute and relative. We shall follow the first division.

Under the head of God's positive attributes come

especially His Unity, Love, Wisdom, Holiness, Goodness and Mercy, Justice and Truth. While these are internal attributes, the external, positive attributes are Omnipotence and Omniscience; and the negative attributes are Simplicity, Infinity, Immutability, Eternity, and Immensity. As there is often misconception in regard to the negative attributes, it will be well to point out what we mean by each.

1. God is Simple. God's Simplicity is referred to in the First of the Articles of Religion in the words, God is without 'parts or passions.' The Latin is 'impartibilis et impassibilis.' But 'impartibilis' means 'incapable of division,' and 'impassibilis' 'incapable of suffering.' Hence God's attribute of Simplicity implies, on the one hand, that God is immaterial and incorporeal, and on the other that there can be in Him no kind of composition, and that consequently every difference between potentiality and actuality, or between realities completing each other, is excluded from our idea of God.

2. When we say that God is Infinite, this follows from His Aseity, from His being uncaused, for the limitation of an effect is the result of its having a cause. Negatively, we mean by the Infinity of God that the limitations which bind us do not confine Him; and positively, that every perfection is possessed by God absolutely and exhaustively.

3. God is Immutable, that is, He cannot change; for if He could change, He must change from a more perfect to a less perfect state, or *vice versâ*; hence change would imply imperfection in God, and would contradict His attribute of Absolute Perfection. His Immutability also proceeds necessarily from His Simplicity and Unity, for a thing is said to be changed in regard to time or form, neither of which enters into the account of the Divine Essence, which is absolutely Simple and One.

4. God is Eternal, and the word 'Eternity' is sometimes inaccurately understood as that which has no end, but strictly it signifies that which exists necessarily, and has neither beginning, end, nor change. 'Eternity' is distinguished from 'Immutability' in that 'Immutability' is only the negation of change, while 'Eternity' expresses duration and perseverance in Essence, together with the negation of measure. Eternity therefore is to time what Immensity is to space, and both belong to God necessarily, because He is Infinite and Self-existing.

5. God is Immense, and, as we have seen, His Immensity is closely allied to His Eternity. In the ninth verse of the Athanasian Creed, 'The Father Incomprehensible, the Son Incomprehensible, and the Holy Ghost Incomprehensible,' the word 'Incomprehensible' is a translation of 'Immensus' in the original Latin Creed. God is Immense or Incomprehensible, because He is independent of all conditions of space, so that He is present in all space; not by extension, as a material body; not definitely, as the soul of man is present in his body, for both of these modes imply limitation; but God is wholly everywhere, that is, He is present by His Essence everywhere. God's Immensity follows from His Infinity as that does from His Aseity.

III. Of the Holy Trinity.

Of the internal life of the Godhead natural religion can tell us nothing. For this we must depend entirely upon revelation, as unfolded and interpreted by the Church under the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

In the Old Testament the first great revelation in regard to God's nature is the Unity of the Godhead. 'Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord.'[1]

[1] Deut. vi. 4.

Surrounded on all sides by polytheism, the Jews bore consistent witness to the Oneness of God.

Here and there in the Old Testament we find adumbrations of the Trinity, but it is not until God manifests Himself in the Incarnation that the inner life of the Godhead is revealed to the Church in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. This doctrine is one of those absolute mysteries which human reason by itself could never have discovered, or even have thought possible. It is probably one of the chief of those 'deep things of God' of which S. Paul tells us, 'No man knoweth, but the Spirit of God,' but that 'God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit.'[1] In other words the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is purely a matter of revelation, but, having been revealed, it becomes an Article of Faith which enables us to explain, develop, and correct the erroneous views of God derived from natural theology.

While the term 'Trinity' is not found in the New Testament, the doctrine of Three Persons and One God is abundantly revealed throughout; so that S. Augustine, finishing his great work upon the Holy Trinity with a prayer, in it appeals to Holy Scripture as he addresses God thus:[2] 'O Lord our God, we believe in Thee, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, for the Truth could not say, "Go, baptize all nations in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," unless Thou wast a Trinity;[3] nor wouldest Thou command us to be baptized, O Lord God, in the Name of Him Who is not the Lord God; nor could it be said with utterance divine, "Hear, O Israel: the Lord thy God is One,"[4] unless Thou wast so a Trinity as to be One Lord God: And if Thou, O

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 10.
[2] S. Aug., *De Trinitate*, lib. xv. cap. xxviii. 51; Migne, *P. L.* xlii. col. 1097, 1098.
[3] S. Matt. xxviii. 19.
[4] Deut. vi. 4.

God, wast Thyself the Father, and wast Thyself the Son, Thy Word Jesus Christ, and Thy Gift, the Holy Spirit, we should not read in the writings of Truth "God sent His Son";[1] nor couldest Thou, O Only Begotten One, say of the Holy Spirit, "Whom the Father will send in My name";[2] and "Whom I will send unto you from the Father."'[3]

The doctrine of the Holy Trinity is as follows: In the Unity of the Godhead there are three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, really distinct in Person, yet in all respects co-equal and of one substance. The Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten of the Father, the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son. In God all things are common to the three Persons, except where there is the opposition of relation, that is, in those peculiar characteristics which make them to be severally Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

i. In the Internal Life of the Blessed Trinity we may notice:

1. That the Essence, Substance, or Nature of God is One, so that while there be three Persons in the Godhead there are not three Gods.

2. In the Divine Essence there are two *Processions*, that of the Son and that of the Holy Ghost. The word 'procession' means the origination of one thing from another. Where the thing originated is not really distinct in essence from the principal which originated it, the procession is termed 'Immanent Procession.'

(*a*) The procession of the Son or Word from the Father is called a 'Generation.' The Son proceeds from the Father by an act of the intellect, and this act is termed 'Eternal Generation,' by this we mean not only that there never was a time when the Father existed without generating the Son, but also that the act of Generation is a *continuous* act; so that if, as

[1] S. John iii. 17. [2] S. John xiv. 26. [3] S. John xv. 26.

some heretics teach, there was during the historic life of the Incarnate Word on earth a separation between the Father and the Son, both Father and Son would have ceased to be, inasmuch as, the act of Generation being interrupted by the separation, there would have been no Son, and there being no Son there could have been no Father.

(*b*) The Holy Spirit proceeds Eternally from the Father and the Son, not as from two Origins, but as from one, and not by two Spirations, but by one Spiration. He proceeds therefore by an act of the will, and as we have no name for this procession suggested by what occurs in man, and as the act of intellect by which the Father generates the Son is virtually distinct from the act of will by which the Father with the Son breathes forth the Holy Spirit, the general word 'Spiration' (breathing) is used for this procession of the Holy Spirit. 'Active Spiration' is used to describe the act in the person from whom he proceeds; 'Passive Spiration,' the result in Him who proceeds. As the Holy Spirit, like the Son, is not distinct in Essence from the Father, from Whom He proceeds, this also is a case of Immanent Procession. The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father only as from the Source, Fountain, or Beginning. He is the Eternal Love of the Father and the Son, mutually breathed forth by them, and is, as it were, the Bond of Union in the Eternal Trinity. As the Father is the Manifestation of the Power, and the Son of the Intellect, so is the Holy Ghost of the Will of the Deity. Our Lord, in reference to the temporal mission of the Holy Ghost, speaks in the same verse of His proceeding from the Father and being sent by Himself: 'But when the Comforter is come, Whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, Which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me.'[1]

[1] S. John xv. 26.

3. Thus there are in the Godhead three distinct Persons, so that while Each is severally God and Lord, and possessed of all the divine attributes which (as we have seen) are identical with the Divine Essence, they yet are distinct in Person, so that the Father is not the Son or the Holy Ghost, nor is the Son the Father or the Holy Ghost, nor is the Holy Ghost the Father or the Son.

4. There are also in the Godhead four *Relations*. By the term 'relation' we mean a condition or order which arises from the contemplation of a being which we contemplate simultaneously with another being which is in some respects distinct from it. One is then said to be related to the other. The first is called the 'subject' of the relation, the other the 'term'; and that by which the relation is constituted the 'foundation.' For example, the relation of two brothers or of a father to a son is in each case founded on parentage.

Since the Nature of God is One, the three Persons can be distinguished by nothing but their Relations; and as each of the two processions gives rise to a relation between the Principal and him that proceeds, there are therefore four Relations; for in each procession we may consider the Relation of the producer to the produced, and of the produced to the producer. Thus between the Father and the Son we have the Relation of Paternity and Filiation, while the second procession, that of the Holy Ghost, furnishes the Relations of Active Spiration and Passive Spiration.

5. There are also in the Holy Trinity five *Notions*. That by which one of the Divine Persons is distinguished from another is called a 'notion,' because it makes the Person 'known.' Thus it belongs to the first Person only to be Unproduced and to be Father, the second Person alone is Son, and together with the first Person is the Spirator (or Breather), and the third

Person is the Spirit (or Breath). Thus the five Notions are Innascibility, Paternity, Filiation, Active Spiration, and Passive Spiration.

ii. In treating of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity we must be very careful on the one hand to preserve the Unity of the Godhead, and on the other hand to avoid Tritheism. The doctrine of the Perichoresis, Circuminsession or Circumincession—all of which words signify the act of settling round about a place (*περίχωρος*, *circum-insideo* or *circumincedo*)—is the doctrine which specially guards the Holy Trinity from Tritheism. It expresses the co-existence and presence of the Persons of the Holy Trinity in one another by reason of their identity of Nature and Essence; as our Lord said, 'I am in the Father, and the Father in Me.'[1] And again, 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.'[2] And again, 'I and the Father are One.'[3]

These passages prove:

1. The distinction of Persons as against Sabellians.
2. Their equality as against Arians.
3. The Oneness of their nature as against Tritheists.

iii. The two chief errors regarding the Holy Trinity into which men have fallen are Sabellianism and Tritheism.

1. The first of these confounds the Persons, and so denies the Trinity, by asserting that they are only three names, modes, or characters of one Person. This doctrine is sometimes called 'Patripassianism,' for it taught that it was really the Father Who suffered on Calvary.

2. The opposite error is Tritheism, whereby men have held that in the Trinity are three Substances in all things similar, as if there were three Deities. In the present day the more extreme Kenotists or teachers of our Lord's ignorance are practically Tritheists,

[1] S. John xiv. 11. [2] S. John xiv. 9. [3] S. John x. 30.

in that they teach separation between the second Person, or the Word, and the Father, and thus, by destroying the Unity of the Godhead, they make a plurality of Gods.[1]

These two errors are refuted in the Athanasian Creed in the fourth verse: 'Neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance.'

iii. At the risk of some repetition it will be well to state a little more fully these two sides of the doctrine of the Trinity: that God is One, but that in that Unity there is a threefold distinction of Personality.

1. In speaking of the Unity of the Godhead we must not be content merely with the idea of numerical unity, which the word at first suggests. When we speak of One God, of course we exclude the idea of plurality; and this was the first monotheistic revelation of the Old Testament, that God had no compeer, no rival. But this by no means exhausts what we mean by the Unity of the Godhead.

From numerical unity we pass to individual unity, as when we think of ourselves as individuals, on the one hand separated from all other individuals, and on the other hand identically one through all the experiences of our life, so that the old man and the boy are linked together in the individual unity of one life. This conception of unity also we must apply to the Unity of the Godhead.

But there is a higher and more complex idea of Unity bound up with our conception of personality. Among the many ideas which go to make up our conception of personality, the three most prominent perhaps are self-consciousness, a power of will, and a self-sufficiency.[2] An examination of the last is

[1] These definitions are taken almost verbatim from the author's *Catholic Faith and Practice*, vol. i. pp. 13-18.

[2] Aristotle's αὐταρκὴς καὶ οὐδένος ἐνδεής.

disappointing and humiliating as regards human personality, since the more we investigate the more we find that man is not 'self-sufficient and lacking in nothing,' that as a social being he is dependent on others for the completion of his personality in many ways, but especially in love. Here, where man fails in personal unity, God's Unity is Perfect in the Holy Trinity, for God is Love, and in the Internal Life of the Godhead that Love is ever satisfied. His is the One and Only Self-sufficient Personal Nature.

In all these ways, then, we must insist upon the Unity of God, only applying to it the Method of Supereminence, and realising that the various aspects of unity which we recognise in ourselves exist in the Godhead supereminently.

2. God, then, is One; we cannot too carefully insist on this; but in the Substance of the Godhead are three distinctions, three hypostases, three Persons. Since, however, we do not use any of these three terms, 'Substance,' 'Hypostasis,' 'Person,' in their ordinary sense, we must here examine the theological meaning which attaches to the terms used in speaking of the Holy Trinity.

(*a*) The word 'Trinity,' the Greek Τριάς, is found for the first time in the writings of Theophilus of Antioch (180), who refers to the first Triad of the days of creation as types of the Trinity (Τριάδος) of God, of His Word, and of His Wisdom.[1] A little later the Latin *Trinitas* is found in the writings of Tertullian.[2] After this it is used as a recognised theological term.

(*b*) We have already called attention[3] to the heresies which distracted the Church in Rome towards the close

[1] Theoph. Antioch, *Ad Autolycum*, ii. 15; Migne, *P. G.* vi. col. 1077.
[2] Tert., *Adv. Praxeam.* iii.; Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 158.
[3] Cf. pp. 23, 24.

of the second century during the episcopates of Victor and Zephyrinus.[1] Amongst others, Theodotus and Praxeas, representatives of opposing Christological theories, were active. The former taught that Christ was a mere man; the latter seems to have been the originator of that heresy which is called 'Patripassianism' from its doctrine, and 'Sabellianism' from its principal teacher. It was to confute these heresies that the terms 'Substance' and 'Person' were coined.

Against the Sabellians, who accepted the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ, but denied His personal distinction from the Father, and accused those who taught the doctrine of the Trinity of Tritheism, Tertullian uses the word 'Substance,' asserting that the Son is of one Substance with the Father.[2] The Greek fathers used two words to express the Nature or Essence of the Godhead communicated to the Son and Holy Spirit, viz. *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*. Clement of Alexandria, Justin Martyr, and Origen use *οὐσία* in this sense. Ὑπόστασις is found in Dionysius of Rome, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Athanasius.

While defending the Unity of the Godhead against Tritheism, it became also necessary to define, as against Sabellianism, the distinctions in the Godhead, and theological writers found it difficult to agree upon the word to represent this distinction. Some Greek writers (as Hippolytus) used *πρόσωπα*, although this was given up, on account of its equivocal meaning, for *ὑπόστασις*.

In the West Tertullian, the first Latin father, had coined the word 'Personæ,'[3] and this word has prevailed in the Church's vocabulary. But we must carefully investigate in what sense these words

[1] Cf. Zahn, *The Apostles' Creed*, pp. 33-54.
[2] Tert., *Adv. Praxeam.* ii.; Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 157.
[3] Tert., *Adv. Praxeam.* vii., xii.; Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 161, 167.

were used. There are two Greek words, *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*, with their Latin equivalents, 'Substantia' and 'Persona.' If, however, we have regard only to the etymon of the words, we see that *ὑπόστασις* is the Greek equivalent of 'Substantia,' although *theologically* 'Substantia' has been made to correspond with the Greek *οὐσία* (*essentia*), while an entirely new word, 'Persona,' has been chosen to represent *ὑπόστασις*. This word 'Persona' was used first by Tertullian, and later tentatively by S. Augustine, but it was really Boethius who introduced it into the Church's vocabulary of theological terms, defining 'Persona' as 'the individual substance of a rational nature.'[1]

'Ουσία differs from *ὑπόστασις* theologically in that *οὐσία* signifies the generic nature, and *ὑπόστασις* the specific nature, of a thing. Hence *οὐσία* is used for the Essence, Substance, or Generic Nature of the Godhead, while *ὑπόστασις* is limited to the distinctions in the Godhead which the Greeks called 'Hypostases,' and the Westerns 'Persons.' This word 'Persona,' which has passed into the theology of the Church, was at first received with suspicion, and, as we have observed, its Greek equivalent *πρόσωπα* was abandoned; for, if we have regard to the etymon of 'Persona,' a mask or character, it would be precisely the word which the Sabellians would wish to use; while, if we take it in the modern sense of personality, as indicating self-consciousness and a power of will, it might seem to imply that in the Holy Trinity there were three Beings, having three distinct Wills, and therefore three distinct Gods. While we have no other word to use, and the word 'Persona' has much to commend it, we must very carefully guard ourselves against both of these heretical misapplications of the term.

[1] Boethius, *De Persona et Duabus Naturis*, iii.; Migne, *P. L.* tom. lxiv. p. 1343.

IV. Of the Father Almighty.

i. The word 'Father' may be used in this Article either *essentially* or *personally*. If it be used *essentially*, it refers to the three persons of the Holy Trinity, as when we speak of the Fatherhood of God; but if it be applied *personally*, it has regard only to the first Person of the Holy Trinity, as when we speak of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

1. The word 'Father' is applied *essentially* to God in respect to all creation which comes from Him; since as a Father He made and sustains all His creatures. So we read in Isaiah, 'Doubtless Thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: Thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer; Thy name is from everlasting';[1] and in Deuteronomy, 'Is not He thy Father that hath bought thee? hath He not made thee, and established thee?'[2]

2. God, too, is *essentially* the Father of all Christians whom He has adopted in Christ as His children. So S. Paul says, 'Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.'[3]

ii. The name 'Father' is *personally* applied to the first Person of the Holy Trinity, for this is His proper name. He is termed 'Father' in respect to His Only Begotten Son, the second Person of the Holy Trinity; for, as Rufinus says, 'When thou hearest the word "Father" understand the Father of the Son, Who is the image of the aforesaid Substance. For, as no one is called "Lord" unless he have a lordship or a slave to order, and as no one is called "Master" unless he have

[1] Isa. lxiii. 16. [2] Deut. xxxii. 6. [3] Rom. viii. 15, 16.

a disciple, so the Father can in no way be spoken of but as having a Son.'[1] And S. Gregory of Nazianzus says, 'Father is not a name of substance, or of action, but of relation. It indicates the relationship the Father has to the Son, or the Son to the Father.'[2]

Again, we must carefully observe that the Father is the Principle or Ἀρχη, not only as regards creation, for this He shares with the other persons of the Holy Trinity, but He is the Principle in the order of origin in respect of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. He is the Fountain (Πηγή) of the Supersubstantial Deity. Himself underived, from Him the Son derives Generation, and the Holy Ghost Procession.

iii. The Father *Almighty.* The word translated 'Almighty' (παντοκράτωρ) does not so much signify that God is able to do all things as that nothing can be done apart from Him, that He is the Source of all Power, that He upholds and maintains in being all things, whether spiritual or material; and this Power, in so far as it is personal, He communicates to the Son and to the Spirit, so that we say, 'So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, the Holy Ghost Almighty: and yet there are not three Almighties, but one Almighty.'[3]

V. Of Creation.

Maker of heaven and earth. This clause, as we have seen in our historical investigation of the Creeds, was not found in the earliest forms of the Apostles' Creed, but was introduced apparently to meet certain Gnostic heresies.

i. The Gnostics were divided into

[1] Rufin. in *Expos. Symb.*; Migne, *P. L.* xxi. 335-386.
[2] S. Greg. Naz., *Orat.* xxix. (xxxv.); Migne, *P. G.* xxxvi. col. 96.
[3] Athanasian Creed, v. 13.

1. Monarchianists, and
2. Dualists.

1. The Monarchianists, who believed in one Principle of all things, were openly Pantheistic, and held not only that God is All, but that all is God;

2. While the Dualists believed in two Eternal Principles, spirit or mind and matter. From the latter developed Manichæism. Both alike are refuted by this clause in the Creed; for God is the Maker of all things, visible and invisible, spiritual and material.

1. He is in all things by Immanence, yet the universe is not God. God is All, but all is not God.

2. And as against Manichæism, He is the Maker of all things visible (that is, material) and invisible. There was no room for any Demiurge who made matter.

ii. In this Creation we may recognise three divisions:

1. Things invisible, that is, of pure spirit. In this category we place the angels, all of whom were subjected to trial, and some of whom fell and became devils.

2. Things visible, that is, things purely corporeal, the material substances of which the universe is made up.

3. A composite Creation, that of man, possessed of a material body and an immaterial soul and spirit.

iii. The Church does not put forth any particular view in regard to the method of God's Creation, and indeed she has suffered much from the speculations of theologians concerning the Mosaic Cosmogony which at one time were considered to have her authority; so that, when they were overthrown by scientific investigation, their destruction seemed to threaten the overthrow of the Church's teaching. Revelation teaches us clearly that God is the Creator and Conservator of all things, that is, that God not only brought us and all things into being by an act of

Creation, but that He preserves us in existence by a distinct exercise of His Divine Power; so that if God were to cease to act upon us as the cause of our being, we should at once cease to exist. This Divine Action, by which our life and that of all the creatures is preserved, is called 'Conservation.'

CHAPTER II

ARTICLE II

And in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord.—*Apostles' Creed.*

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God; begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God; begotten, not made; being of one Substance with the Father; by Whom all things were made.—*Nicene Creed.*

For the right Faith is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man.—*Athanasian Creed.*

As we have already treated of much of this Article under the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, we shall confine ourselves to an examination of such parts only as were not there considered.

I. Of Jesus Christ.

1. Jesus, the human name of our Blessed Lord, was bestowed upon Him through the revelation of an angel, both to S. Mary[1] and to S. Joseph.[2] 'Jesus' is the Greek form of the Hebrew name 'Joshua,'[3] or 'Jeshua,'[4] a contraction of 'Jehoshua,'[5] which signifies 'Help of Jehovah, or Saviour.'

This name of Salvation in the Creed is a Confession that our Lord is the Saviour of the world:

[1] S. Luke i. 31. [2] S. Matt. i. 21; cf. also S. Luke ii. 21.
[3] Num. xiv. 6. [4] 1 Chron. xxiv. 11. [5] Num. xiii. 16.

1. 'Inasmuch as He hath revealed to the sons of men the only way for the salvation of their souls,

2. 'And has wrought this same way out for them by the virtue of His blood obtaining remission for sinners, making reconciliation for enemies, paying the price of redemption for captives, and

3. 'Shall at last actually confer the same Salvation . . . upon all those who unfeignedly and steadfastly believe in Him.'[1]

ii. Christ. As 'Jesus' is the proper name of our Saviour, so 'Christ' is the title of His office. It is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew 'Messiah' and signifies 'The Anointed One.' Under this title our Lord's coming was foretold by the prophets of old, so that the Jewish people looked forward to the coming of the Messiah as the culmination of their blessings and the realisation of their brightest hopes. They, however, entirely misunderstood the real significance of these prophecies.

The title 'Christ' refers to the anointing of our Lord's Manhood by the Holy Ghost, thus appointing Him as the Son of Man to the threefold office of Prophet, Priest, and King; for each of these was consecrated by Unction. Thus, to take only one example of each, we find King Saul anointed by Samuel at God's command.[2] We observe the consecration to the Priesthood was also by Unction.[3] So, too, of the Prophetic office (though probably not universally) in the case of Elisha.[4]

If we turn to our Lord we find not only the prophecy in the Old Testament that He was to be the Messiah or Anointed One, but the fulfilment of the prophecy in the New Testament.

1. In regard to the Prophetical office our Lord claims this when, after reading the prophecy of

[1] Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 149.
[2] 1 Sam. xv. 1; xvi. 12.
[3] Exod. xl. 15.
[4] 1 Kings xix. 15, 16.

Esaias, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me to preach the gospel to the poor,' he adds, 'This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears.'[1]

2. Again, at His baptism, 'The Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon Him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in Thee I am well pleased.'[2] This has been regarded as the Unction to the Priesthood; for it was the beginning of His ministerial work.

3. In the fullest sense He assumed His Royal Power after His Ascension, though it was typified by his riding into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday, in fulfilment of the prophecy of Zechariah, 'Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: He is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.'[3]

These instances, however, were only typical manifestations of the Unction of the Son of Man as Prophet, Priest, and King. The actual anointing took place at the moment of His conception, and the agent was the Holy Ghost, as the Angel Gabriel revealed to Mary: 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.'[4]

So S. Peter in his address to Cornelius says, 'God *anointed* Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power.'[5]

The Unction of the Holy Ghost, while given first and in its fulness to our Blessed Lord, flows down upon all His members, as was prophesied in the Psalms, 'Behold, how good and joyful a thing it is: brethren to dwell together in unity. It is like the

[1] S. Luke iv. 18, 21. Also cf. Isa. lxi. 1. [2] S. Luke iii. 22.
[3] Zech. ix. 9. [4] S. Luke i. 35. [5] Acts x. 38.

precious ointment upon the head, that ran down unto the beard: even unto Aaron's beard, and went down to the skirts of his clothing.'[1]

The Unction of the Church's Head, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, flows down to His members, to every baptized Christian, and all alike, as members of Christ are partakers in a measure in His three offices of Prophet, Priest, and King.

1. In Baptism, and especially in Confirmation, we are anointed with gifts of the Holy Ghost to enable us as prophets to teach, not only by our words, but in our lives, the Gospel of Christ.

2. We are, too, S. Peter tells us, 'An Holy Priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.'[2] And again he says, 'Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people.'[3]

There is a priesthood of the laity, a privilege, and therefore a responsibility; the privilege, S. Peter tells us, of offering spiritual sacrifices.

The great privilege of every Christian is to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar. If we realised this, how we should throng the churches at the celebration of the Holy Eucharist to exercise our priestly privilege and to plead the sacrifice of the death of Christ; for this, as our Catechism tells us, was the first end for which the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was ordained.[4]

Then is added the privilege and duty of offering with the Sacrifice of the Altar, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice.

3. But not only are we a Priesthood, but a *Royal* Priesthood. So we read in the Revelation that Jesus

[1] Ps. cxxxiii. 1, 2. [2] 1 S. Peter ii. 5. [3] 1 S. Peter ii. 9.

[4] Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained? For the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby.—*Church Catechism.*

Christ 'hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father.' And if we are kings, surely it behoves us to live worthy of our lineage, not only outwardly comporting ourselves as the children of God, the King of kings, but inwardly cultivating those virtues which belong to our royal estate; for the Psalmist tells us, 'The King's daughter is all glorious within: her clothing is of wrought gold.'[1] Within glorious, through the Unction of the Holy Ghost, in the possession of His gifts; and without, clad in the raiment of good works, which are the fruits of the Holy Spirit.

II. Of the Only Begotten Son of God.

We have already treated of the Eternal Generation of the Only Begotten Son, God the Word, in the life of the Holy Trinity, and in the next Article we shall consider His Generation in time through the operation of the Holy Ghost upon the substance of the Blessed Virgin, by which He became Man. There remains, therefore, only that we should here notice the epithets which are applied to God the Son in this second Article of the Creed.

i. In the Apostles' Creed He is called the *Only* Son; in the Latin, 'Unicum,' and in the Greek, μονογενῆ. Here we are reminded that our Lord's Sonship differs in kind, as well as in degree, from ours. He is Only-Begotten by Eternal Generation, and therefore of the same substance as the Father, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God; begotten, not made; by Whom all things were made.

We are God's sons by creation, and, better, by adoption through membership in Christ, born again, or regenerate by the Holy Ghost; for 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter

[1] Ps. xlv. 13.

into the Kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.'[1]

ii. We must further briefly explain the doctrine of the 'Subordination' of the Son, which we gather especially from a passage of S. John and another of S. Paul, viz: 'I go unto the Father: for My Father is greater than I';[2] and, 'When all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be All in all.'[3]

We must approach the study of these passages with a clear grasp of the fundamental truth that in the Godhead there is and can be no inequality; for as we confess in the Athanasian Creed: 'In this Trinity none is afore, or after other: none is greater, or less than another; But the whole three Persons are co-eternal together; and co-equal.'

This disposes of all the Arian misinterpretations of these passages which would overthrow the Divinity of Christ and destroy the true doctrine of God. We find in the Church two schools of interpretation which are in no sense contradictory, and indeed must be combined in order that we may obtain a full view of the Church's teaching in regard to this mystery. Western theologians, dwelling on the fact that both passages refer especially to the Incarnate and Mediatorial Life of our Blessed Lord, explain the inferiority or subordination only of our Lord's Manhood. Of this we have the best exposition in the Athanasian Creed: 'That our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man; . . . Equal to the Father, as touching His Godhead: and inferior to the Father, as touching His Manhood.' Eastern writers, however, take these passages of our Lord's Essential Deity, and while pointing out that it in no way implies any subtraction from the Essential

[1] S. John iii. 5, 6. [2] S. John xiv. 28. [3] 1 Cor. xv. 28.

Deity of the Son, show the subordination consists in the truth that the Son's life is derived from the Father's, as Bishop Pearson puts it: 'The Father hath Essence of Himself, the Son by communication from the Father.'[1] The Father being the Source and Fountain (Ἀρχη and Πηγή) of the Godhead, the Son derives His Being from Him, and this is expressed in the Nicene Creed in the words, 'God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, begotten, not made.'

III. Of Jesus Christ our Lord.

Throughout the Old Testament the word which is rendered in our version 'Lord' is 'Jehovah,' and in the Septuagint this is uniformly translated by Κύριος, the New Testament word for 'Lord.' Thus 'Lord' implies the possession of supreme dominion as God.

The title 'Lord' belongs to each of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity, as we say in the Athanasian Creed: 'So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord: and the Holy Ghost Lord. And yet not three Lords: but one Lord.' We, however, apply it especially to the Second Person, following the teaching of S. Paul: 'For to us there is but one God, the Father, of Whom are all things, and we in Him; and one *Lord* Jesus Christ, by Whom are all things, and we by Him.'[2] And, 'Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed; and that no man can say that Jesus is the *Lord;* but by the Holy Ghost.'[3]

Essentially, then, Christ is Lord, inasmuch as He is God, and has dominion in common with the Father and the Holy Ghost. *Vicariously*, He is Lord through

[1] Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. i.
[2] 1 Cor. viii. 6.
[3] 1 Cor. xii. 3.

the Incarnation, for after the resurrection He said to His Apostles, 'All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth.'[1] And we read in the Epistle to the Ephesians that God 'put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the Head over all things to the Church.'[2]

By the title 'Lord,' as applied to our Saviour Jesus Christ, we express our sense of our Lord's absolute dominion over us. He claims to rule with a mightier sway than any earthly sovereign ever dreamed of, for He claims to rule not only over the bodies, but over the thoughts and in the hearts of His subjects. S. Paul, in recognition of this prerogative, loves to call himself the servant, that is, the bond-slave (δοῦλος) of Jesus Christ. And when we speak of Christ as our Lord, if we realise what we are saying, we are confessing our faith in His absolute dominion over us, and therefore professing our entire love and loyalty to Him. If Jesus Christ is our Lord, then all that we have, and all that we are, we lay at His feet, realising that the noblest duty of life is to render Him loving and loyal service.

[1] S. Matt. xxviii. 18. [2] Eph. i. 22.

CHAPTER III

ARTICLE III

Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.—*Apostles' Creed.*

Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary.—*Nicene Creed.*

Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

For the right Faith is, that we believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man;

God, of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds: and Man, of the Substance of His Mother, born in the world;

Perfect God, and perfect Man: of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting;

Equal to the Father, as touching His Godhead: and inferior to the Father, as touching His Manhood.

Who although He be God and Man: yet He is not two, but one Christ;

One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking of the Manhood into God;

One altogether; not by confusion of Substance: but by unity of Person.

For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God and Man is one Christ.—*Athanasian Creed.*

Of the Incarnation.

In this Article of our Creed we approach the doctrine which is the very keystone and foundation of all our Faith. For it is in the Incarnation that all the doctrines of Christianity centre, and through it alone

that they can be understood in their true relation to one another. To take some examples—The doctrine of God is revealed to us in its fulness only through the Incarnation; without it, we may be Theists, but we can know nothing of the inner life of God, nothing of the Holy Trinity.

Again, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in His work in the Church has to be studied in relation to the Incarnation, for it is as the Spirit of Christ that He operates in the Church, the Agent of Her Sacraments, the Bestower of those gifts of Grace, all of which are extensions to us of the Incarnation.

Then, too, the doctrine of the Atonement can only be rightly understood in its relation to the Incarnation. Isolated from it and regarded by itself, it becomes, as we know from centuries of bitter experience, a stumbling-block both to the reason and to the moral sense of man. Viewed as the necessary outcome of the Incarnation in its relation to sin, we see it to be the most stupendous manifestation of God's Love, the crowning act of His Mercy.

I. As the doctrine of the Incarnation is the central truth of Christianity, so has it been attacked most frequently by heresy, and defined most accurately by the Church. No less than four of her Œcumenical Councils, and those the four greatest, were chiefly devoted to the refutation of error and the establishment of truth in regard to the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. The doctrine itself is expressed most briefly and most perfectly in one short clause in S. John's Gospel, 'The Word was made Flesh,'[1] and it is to the development of this glorious theme that S. John's Gospel and his Epistles are devoted.

The doctrine is thus stated in the second Article of Religion: 'The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and

[1] S. John i. 14.

eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took Man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very Man.'

i. It is natural to ask, What was God's purpose in the Incarnation? Why did it take place? Was it merely the remedy for man's sin, or was it part of God's original purpose in creating, that is, would it have taken place if Adam had not sinned?

These questions have always been discussed by theologians, but we must recognise that the answer can only be a matter of theological opinion, since we have no clear revelation on the subject further than that the Incarnation was caused by God's love, for we are told that 'God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'[1]

Of the two schools of opinion, one is generally known as the Thomist and the other as the Scotist, from the two great theologians who championed the respective views.

S. Thomas Aquinas takes the view that the Incarnation was the remedy for sin, and therefore, considering all the blessings which it brought with it, he speaks of Adam's fall as the 'Felix Culpa.'

Duns Scotus, his Franciscan opponent, points out that it is unseemly that the greatest work of God should have been done as the result of a sin of the creature, and finds in Holy Scripture many indications that the honour of God Incarnate is the real end of all creation.[2]

While the Thomist view has been the more prevalent in the past, the Scotist is the one which seems to be

[1] S. John iii. 16.
[2] Cf. Prov. viii. 22; Col. i. 15; 1 Cor. ii. 7.

held by most English theologians of the present day, not only for the reasons we have mentioned, but because it gives such a consistent explanation of all God's work in creation and redemption. However, as we have said, neither view can be considered as in any sense *de fide*.

ii. The *fact* of the Incarnation may be stated thus: The Incarnation was the taking of Manhood into God, not by a fusion of the human and divine natures, but by the uniting of both (while each nature was kept perfectly distinct) in the one Person of the Word, the Eternal Son of God, the Second Person of the ever-blessed Trinity. The Agent in the Incarnation was the Holy Ghost, the instrument the blessed Virgin Mary. The means was the operation of the Holy Ghost upon the substance of the blessed Virgin, by which act the Word became the Son of Man, without being the son of *a* man; and so took into Himself humanity without taking Adam's state of original sin.

This Virgin birth is not only an Article of Faith in the Church, but it also commends itself to our reason as the only way, so far as we can see, by which the purpose of the Incarnation could be accomplished and humanity taken into God apart from the taint of sin. The Creed tells us that our Lord was made 'Man,' not 'a' man. It was manhood, not a man, human *nature*, not a human *person*, that the Son of God took into union with Himself, and it is of the utmost importance to any clear understanding of the Incarnation to grasp this.

By 'human nature' we mean all those qualities which the race has in common. By a 'human person' we mean a separate individual, possessing that distinct and sovereign power of action in the soul to which we give the name of 'Personality.'

Adam did not transmit to his descendants his own *personality*, for that is incommunicable, but his *nature*.

No human being can part with his own personality or share it with another. When Adam begat sons and daughters he passed on to his offspring his own nature, but his personality remained exclusively his own for ever, and his descendants had each their own personality.

Personality, then, is no essential part of human nature, but human nature is organised on a new personality in every individual. It is therefore not so difficult to understand that in order to cut off the entail of that tainted *moral* nature which we derive from Adam, and to make the hypostatic union of the Divine and human natures possible, the germ of humanity, which was derived from Adam through the blessed Virgin, was vitalised by the direct operation of the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Life-Giver.

Moreover, our Lord's human nature, instead of being, as with us, united to a new human personality, was taken up into the Personality of the Word. Thus, all that was essential to humanity was taken up by the second Adam, and the differences between our Lord's humanity and ours—that He had no human *Father*, no human *Person*, and no *sin*—are none of them differences which touch in any way the integrity and perfection of His human nature.

II. It was around the Incarnation that the first great battle for the Church's orthodoxy was fought. When, at the conversion of Constantine, the Church was freed from the long series of persecutions which had been almost conterminous with her life, the Evil One, who had failed in his attempt to stamp out the Church by force, attempted to corrupt it by error, and one after another those heresies arose which were dealt with by the first four Œcumenical Councils.

i. First, there was the Arian heresy, which, denying the truth that Christ was really God, attacked the per-

fection of His Divine Nature. This was refuted by the Council of Nicæa (325), which defined His Divine Nature in the Creed which we call the Nicene Creed, by declaring Him to be 'Of the same Substance as the Father' (ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί).

ii. Then came a reaction, and Apollinarius, while accepting the Nicene decree respecting the Divine Nature of our Lord, went to the other extreme and denied the reality and perfection of His humanity by asserting that He had no human soul (or νοῦς), its place being, as he held, supplied by the Divine Person of the Word. Thus he really denied the πνεῦμα in man's trichotomy. Now this was taking away from the integrity of our Lord's *human* nature, since a human or rational soul is an essential part of humanity, and is indeed that which differentiates men alike from angels and the brute creation. This heresy was condemned by the second General Council, that of Constantinople (381).

iii. Next there arose the heresy of Nestorius, who, while accepting the decrees of Nicæa and Constantinople concerning the two Natures of our Lord, taught that He had also two Persons, a Human Personality as well as a Divine Personality, thus denying any real union between God and man in the Incarnation. He was strenuously opposed by S. Cyril of Alexandria, through whose efforts he was condemned by the third Œcumenical Council, that of Ephesus (431).

iv. In opposition to Nestorianism, Eutyches taught that as there was but one Person, so there was also but one Nature in our Lord, and that this one Nature was a sort of fusion of the human and Divine and the formation of a third composite nature. This heresy was condemned by the fourth, and in some respects the greatest, of the General Councils, that of Chalcedon (451). In the dogmatic decree of this Council, drawn up at its fifth session, four words were used to define

the relation of the two natures, which have ever since been the bulwark of the Faith in regard to this doctrine: *ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως.*

The whole passage is as follows: 'Following therefore the holy fathers, we all teach with one accord one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, Perfect in His Godhead and Perfect in His Manhood, True God and True Man, consisting of a reasonable soul and of a body, of one Substance with the Father as touching the Godhead, and of one Substance with us as touching the Manhood, like unto us in everything, sin excepted, according to the Godhead begotten of the Father before all time, but in the last days, for us men and for our salvation, according to the Manhood, born of the Virgin Mary the Godbearer, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord—only begotten, confessed in two natures, *without confusion*, *without change*, *without rending or separation*; while the difference of the natures is in no way denied by reason of the union, on the other hand the peculiarity of each nature is preserved and both concur in one Person and Hypostasis.'[1]

It will be observed that Arianism and Apollinarianism were at opposite poles, the one denying the Perfect Divinity, the other the Perfect Humanity of our Lord; and the same opposition is found in Nestorianism and Eutychianism, the one, while admitting two natures, requiring also two personalities; the other admitting but one personality and one nature.

Hence the Catholic Faith is, that there are in our Lord two whole and perfect natures, the human and the Divine, distinct and yet united hypostatically in one Divine Personality in the Eternal Word, the Son of God. This is most accurately expressed in that portion of the Athanasian Creed which we have placed at the head of this Article.

[1] Hefele, vol. iii. 348.

III. There still remain some few points to be considered in connection with the doctrine of the Incarnation.

i. We have seen that the Incarnate Son of God is True Man, although He had no man for His father. The function that ordinarily falls to the father was in this one case performed by the direct action of God, Who can always produce by His own power whatever effects are ordinarily the result of secondary causes; hence the Holy Ghost was the Agent of the Incarnation.

ii. As Man, however, Christ was the Son of Mary, and His body was nourished within her exactly in the same manner as in the ordinary process of gestation; so that Christ was the true Son of Mary.

iii. The human soul of Christ was created and infused into that body at the first instant of its existence, and in the same instant the Divine Word assumed His human nature. It is of the utmost importance that we should realise the truth, that from the first moment of its conception the Holy Thing which was conceived was the Son of God.[1] To hold otherwise would be to assert that for a certain period there was within the womb of Mary a man-child having his own personality, which personality was in some way lost or destroyed when the nature was assumed by the Word, for it is *de fide* that there was but *one* person in Christ.

S. Fulgentius emphatically says: 'Be most firm in your belief, and admit no doubt, that the flesh of Christ was not conceived in the womb of the Virgin before it was assumed by the Word.' From this it follows that the dignity to which human nature was raised, on its assumption by God, involved the consequence that Christ was man from the first instant of conception; from the first Christ was sanctified by grace, had the use of free will, was capable of merit,

[1] S. Luke i. 35.

and enjoyed the clear vision of God. His body grew as the bodies of other infants grow, but His soul was not hampered in its operations by the imperfections of the body which it informed.

iv. Christ's human nature was in no sense subject to original sin, for this, by the Divine decree, is transmitted to those only who have for their father a child of Adam; and Christ had no human father. A higher reason for the sinlessness of Christ is found in the substantial union of humanity with the All-Holy God.

v. Since the will is the principle from which the actions of a rational creature spring, it follows from the presence of two wills, human and Divine, in Christ, that His actions fall into three classes:

1. His union with human nature did not prevent the second Person of the Blessed Trinity from exercising all the powers of the Divine Nature, including the Divine Will. The Divine Will in Christ was the Will which created the world, and which unceasingly maintains creatures in existence and in the exercise of their powers.[1]

2. Another class of actions in Christ proceeds wholly from the human will, and proves that He was truly Man. For instance, to weep is purely human.

3. The third class consists of those acts in which both wills have part. These are called the theandric acts. We have examples of this class of actions whenever our Lord was pleased to work His miracles by the use of some material instrument, as when He put clay on the eyes of the man born blind and bade him to go and wash in the pool of Siloam.[2] Neither the clay nor the washing could have had any efficacy apart from that which the Divine Will gave them. Yet it was in obedience to the human will that our Lord's hand moved to take the clay and apply it. Here,

[1] Col. i. 16, 17. [2] S. John ix. 6, 7.

then, we have an illustration of what may be termed theandric action.

The healing of the Centurion's servant, on the other hand, would come under the first class, where the human will had no direct physical part in the working of the miracle.

vi. Again, we must call attention to the fact that the human nature of Christ was not only assumed by the Divine Word in the first instant of its existence, but that this hypostatic union is permanent, that it never has been and never will be severed, for we read of 'Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.'[1]

vii. As there is a circuminsession in the Blessed Trinity, so in the Person of the Incarnate Word we perceive something similar which we call the 'Communicatio Idiomatum,' that is, the communication of *idioms*, properties, or characteristics. Under this head theologians have decided certain rules of language which must be carefully observed by those who wish to speak with accuracy in regard to the doctrine of the Incarnation. Such concrete names as 'God' and 'Man,' 'Son of God' and 'Son of Man,' denote the Divine or human nature as borne by the Person of the Word, but not the nature alone; but abstract words, such as 'Godhead' and 'Manhood,' denote the natures themselves. From this it follows that concrete words referring to either nature may be used whenever the subject spoken of is the Person of Christ; so that we may say of the Son of Mary that He is God, or that He is Man, indifferently; but we must not say that the Humanity is God, or that the Divinity was born. Again, we may say that God suffered and died, but not that the Godhead suffered and died.

viii. One of the most difficult questions in regard to the Incarnation concerns the knowledge of Christ.

[1] Heb. xiii. 8.

It is clear that our Lord possessed three different sorts of knowledge:

1. Christ as Man from the first moment of His existence enjoyed the beatific vision by which He saw God as He is. This follows from the substantial union between the two natures and from the dignity of true Son of God enjoyed by Christ as Man; and this vision was never interrupted.

2. We are taught, moreover, that Christ as Man, in virtue of His union with the Godhead, had every Divine Perfection which was not incompatible with His state, and especially that His human intellect was perfected by the fulness of the knowledge which is called 'Infused,' that is, knowledge which is not acquired gradually by experience, but is poured into the soul by God. That He had such knowledge the Scriptures clearly teach, for they tell us that on Him rests the 'Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding,[1] and to Him 'God giveth not the Spirit by measure.'[2] This infused knowledge by its very nature of course did not admit of increase. At the same time it was limited by the finite capacity of a human intellect.

3. Besides these two methods of knowledge, Christ also acquired knowledge by the natural use of His faculties, and it is of this S. Luke speaks when he tells us that 'Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man.'[3] This increase was in knowledge acquired experimentally or by the use of His human faculties, as distinguished from the 'infused' knowledge of which we have spoken.

There are difficulties in regard to these different methods of knowledge in our Blessed Lord which have led to much speculation among theologians, and have brought some perilously near to heresy. An attempt to solve such difficulties has resulted in a theory that our Lord, in becoming Incarnate, laid aside His attribute

[1] Isa. xi. 2. [2] S. John iii. 34. [3] S. Luke ii. 52.

of Omniscience, and so was really ignorant of many things, needing to ask and to find out as other men. In its more extreme forms Kenotists have taught the possibility even of error in our Lord's knowledge.

Such speculations go by the name of the κένωσις, from the word ἐκένωσεν used in S. Paul's description of the Incarnation: 'Who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize that He was on an equality with God; but emptied Himself (ἐκένωσεν) by taking upon Him the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.'[1] These theories are found especially in Germany and France and Denmark, in various more or less objectionable forms. They may be traced through Lutheranism back to an early heresy put forth by a man named Beron, who lived probably in the fifth or sixth century, and was answered in a treatise, *Contra Beronem*, of which we have some eight fragments; the name of S. Hippolytus has been attached to them, although they certainly are not his.

This heresy has been amply met by the fathers and great theologians of the Church, and not one theologian of repute can be cited on its side. In its more extreme form it overthrows the Divinity of our Lord, for, as we have already pointed out, God's attributes are God's Essence, and if our Lord in His Incarnation parted with any of His attributes, He would have ceased to be God. The whole question is a very mysterious one and is best left a mystery.

ix. We shall close our treatment of the Incarnation by pointing out that as our Lord was Perfect God and Perfect Man, there were in Him two Wills, the human and the Divine Will. This we have already touched upon in treating of the three modes of action in our Lord; but as the Church was harassed for a long period by the Monothelite heresy, in which even a Pope was involved (Pope Honorius having been condemned and

[1] Phil. ii. 6, 7.

anathematised by the sixth Œcumenical Council, the third of Constantinople [681]), it will be well very briefly to touch upon it.

The Monothelites, who were really Eutychians or Monophysites in disguise, held that there was in Christ only one Will, the Divine Will, and one operation. The Catholic Doctrine is, that as Christ had two natures, so there were in Him two wills and two modes of operation, for since He was Perfect God and Perfect Man, He possessed that which belonged to the perfection of each of these natures; but to will belongs the perfection of His human soul, and therefore there must be in Him a human will. This human will, however, was always in absolute conformity with the Divine Will, as He says in the Gospel of S. John, 'My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work.'[1]

Here we leave this great doctrine of the Christian Faith, at the risk of repetition emphasising the fact that unless it be clearly grasped, there is a danger lest all the other doctrines of Christianity should be either misunderstood or their true proportion lost.

[1] S. John iv. 34.

CHAPTER IV

ARTICLE IV

Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried. —*Apostles' Creed.*

And was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; He suffered and was buried.—*Nicene Creed.*

Who suffered for our salvation.—*Athanasian Creed.*

Of the Atonement.

THE Incarnation and Atonement are often spoken of as the two foundation doctrines of Christianity; and while in a sense this is true, yet the division is scarcely logical, since we cannot separate the Atonement from the Incarnation without running great risk of treating it so disproportionately as to make it, not only overshadow, but almost contradict other Articles of the Faith.

I. We have a striking instance of this in the position which the Atonement occupied in the theological systems of the Reformation. Instead of the Incarnation and Atonement being made the two fundamental doctrines of Christianity, the Atonement was practically made the one and only dogma necessary to salvation; and its various aspects (many of them true in themselves) were so exaggerated as not only to make them contradict other Articles of the Faith, but to be inconsistent with our moral conceptions of God Himself. The danger began not only with isolating the Atone-

ment from the Incarnation, but confining it to the transaction upon the Cross, by which, according to the teachings of most of the Reformers, the debt of sin was paid, the wrath of God appeased, and the salvation of man secured.

Luther and his followers were able to quote many passages from Holy Scripture in which the reconciliation of man with God is ascribed to the shedding of our Lord's precious Blood or to His death upon the Cross; but their mistake lay in regarding this as a forensic transaction entirely separated from all that had gone before of our Lord's life of love and obedience.

While the fact that we were redeemed by the precious Blood of Christ shed upon the Cross is one of the most precious truths of Christianity, it was so taught in the sixteenth century as to represent an angry Father gloating over the sufferings of His innocent Son, exacting a vicarious satisfaction, which was a crude substitution of the innocent for the guilty, and which involved a division of will in the Holy Trinity, the Father being regarded as personifying anger and vindictive justice, the Son as love and patient suffering.

By such a view man's moral nature was outraged, and the question was asked, Is this consistent with belief in a God Who is Love? Can this be reconciled with the idea of justice which God has implanted in human nature? And many of the attacks upon Christianity have been based upon this view of the Atonement.

These difficulties are, at least to a great extent, removed, if we see in the Atonement the necessary working out of the Incarnation in meeting and overcoming the problem of human sin. So far from there being any division in the Holy Trinity, the Father representing the anger of God, and the Son the Love, the Atonement, like the Incarnation, is the work of all

three Persons of the Holy Trinity: 'For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through Him might be saved.'[1]

Besides, the reconciliation of God and man does not take place through any change in God, Who is Immutable, but through that change in man which enables him to respond to the love of God and to appropriate the blessings of redemption. So far from the Atonement being confined to the transaction upon the Cross, that great Act was but the culmination of all that had gone before, the life of unwearied Love, of perfect Obedience, of absolute conformity to the Will of God, which found its final and supreme expression in the voluntary sacrifice upon the Cross.

We may notice that, while of all writers of the New Testament S. Paul treats most fully of the doctrine of 'Redemption through the death of Christ,' yet in his great passage on the Incarnation he associates it most closely with that stupendous mystery, for he says, 'Who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize that He was on an equality with God: but emptied Himself by taking upon Him the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and *being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself*, becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross.'[2]

II. The ideas which go to make up the doctrine of the Atonement are so complex that we must be content with affirming certain truths which are clearly taught in Holy Scripture, recognising that, if our conceptions are paradoxical, it is because they are fragmentary, and that the meeting-point where they are reconciled is often beyond the range of our finite vision. We

[1] S. John iii. 16, 17. [2] Phil. ii. 6, 7, 8.

must recognise that even in this life faith has for its property obscurity, that 'Now we see in a glass darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.'[1]

Then we must remember that in the doctrine of the Atonement we are not helped by the decrees of Œcumenical Councils; that, while it was clearly held by the fathers of the early Church, and found an expression in all the Creeds, yet it was not, like the Incarnation, the battle-ground of heresy; so that we are not helped by Œcumenical decrees or even by theological treatises.

i. Indeed, the history of the doctrine is such as to prevent us from claiming for any particular theory of the Atonement the authority of the Church. The ante-Nicene fathers, with the exception perhaps of S. Irenæus and Origen, can scarcely be said to have had any theory on the subject. There is no trace in their writings of the Reformation doctrine that our sins are imputed to Christ, and His obedience imputed to us; or that God was angry with His Son for our sakes, and inflicted on Him the punishment due to us.

On the contrary there is much in these fathers which expressly negatives this line of thought. The Incarnation is invariably and exclusively ascribed to God's Love, and, where Christ is said to suffer for us, the word ὑπέρ, 'for our sake,' not ἀντί, 'in our stead,' is always used. They ascribe the most real and vital efficacy to the sacrifice of Calvary in restoring us to life and immortality, but without attempting any precise explanation of *how* this result is brought about. The obedience of Christ is dwelt upon as an integral part of His redeeming work, but a special virtue is assigned to His death and His Blood.

S. Barnabas and S. Ignatius are the first to speak of

[1] 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

the conquest over Satan, which in the hands of S. Irenæus and Origen becomes the basis of a distinct theory of satisfaction.

ii. From the fourth century two tendencies, divergent, but not necessarily contradictory (since both are often found in the same writer), manifest themselves in the treatment of the Atonement. The theory of Origen, that our Lord's death was a ransom paid for our deliverance from the power of Satan, who, Origen taught, had obtained an actual right over man through sin. This theory of a ransom, with its three subsidiary ideas,

(1) Of Satan's claim to a payment,
(2) Of a deceit being practised on him,
(3) And of the necessity of compensation,

practically held its own till the time of S. Anselm, and indeed is found in Peter Lombard half a century later.

S. Anselm's great work *Cur Deus Homo* marks a new departure in the history of this doctrine. He expressly and unreservedly rejects the theory of a ransom paid to Satan by the death of Christ, on the principle that it contradicts the Omnipotence and the Goodness of God to suppose that He can recognise any right of evil and injustice in His own world. S. Anselm does not deny that there was a certain fitness in the devil being overcome by the wood of the Cross, as he had overcome men by the wood of the Tree of Life.

For it he substitutes the theory of a debt due to God, which debt, the sinner being unable to pay, must be paid by One who is both God and Man; hence the necessity of the Incarnation, which would not suffice of itself, but must find its culmination in the obedience even unto death, the death of the Cross. Such were the pre-Reformation theories in regard to the Atonement. We have thus briefly reviewed them only to

show that no theory on this subject can be claimed to be in any sense *de fide*.[1]

III. From the Atonement as a theory discussed by theologians we turn to the Atonement as a fact revealed in Holy Scripture, and one of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

In five different places S. Paul speaks of the reconciliation of the world, or of men, to God.[2] The word translated 'Reconciliation' (καταλλαγή) has as its fundamental idea 'to effect a change or exchange,' and is especially used of change in a person from enmity to friendship. As we have observed, this change must take place in man, not in God; it is man who is reconciled to God, not God to man. In three of the passages quoted the means by which this reconciliation is effected is indicated:

1. As the death of the Son of God. 'For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the *death* of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life.'

2. As the blood of Christ. 'But now in Christ Jesus, ye who were sometimes far off are made nigh by the *blood* of Christ.'

3. As the blood of Christ's cross. 'For it pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the *blood of His Cross*, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself.'

In these passages the word 'Reconciliation' is actually used, but there are very many others in which man's redemption is referred to our Lord's sacrifice or death upon the Cross.[3]

[1] Cf. Oxenham, *The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*, pp. 112-178.

[2] Rom. v. 10, 11; xi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 18, 20; Eph. ii. 13-18; Col. i. 20, 22.

[3] S. John iii. 14, 15; 1 Thess. v. 9, 10; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; Gal. ii. 20; S. Matt. xx. 28; Rom viii. 32; Eph. v. 2; Eph. v. 25; Titus

We can learn much about the Atonement not only from Holy Scripture, but from that other book of God's Revelation, human nature; for where we find certain fundamental ideas universal in mankind, we may assume that those ideas were implanted by God, that is, that they are a witness to something which human nature needs or desires. Now we find three fundamental conceptions in regard to the doctrine we are considering, which are practically universal in human consciousness. There is:

1. The sense of sin in the human soul.

2. A fact almost as universal, the existence of sacrifice as a means of approaching God.

3. A recognition of God's attributes of Mercy and Truth, of Love and Justice.

1. If we examine the first, the sense of sin, we find everywhere a twofold conception of the effect of sin upon the soul. First, a sense of *alienation* from God, Who is the Source of all true life; and flowing from this, when the consequences of this separation from God are realised, an intense longing for a reconciliation, and yet with a conviction that sinful man can do nothing to accomplish this re-union with the Divine Life. Secondly, an even more deeply grounded conviction of *guilt*, which involves, when it is analysed, the recognition of an external power against whom the sin has been committed, and also an internal feeling that we deserve punishment.

2. The second universal fact to which we would call attention is the existence everywhere, where religion can be traced, of some sacrificial system. Reaching back to the gates of Paradise, and extending as far as man's investigations of the religions of the world, everywhere we find in some form or other the

ii. 13, 14; 1 S. Pet. iii. 18; S. John x. 11, 15, 18; S. John xv. 13; Rom. v. 6, 8; 1 S. Pet. ii. 24; Rom. v. 10; Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 21, 22; Phil. ii. 8, 9; Heb. ii. 14, 15; Heb. xiii. 12.

idea of sacrifice; and bound up with this we also see two ideas corresponding to the twofold conception of sin. The sacrifice is regarded

(*a*) As a means of reconciling man to God, and so doing away with the *alienation* which sin had caused; and

(*b*) As the means of removing the *guilt* and punishment which sin had involved.

3. In addition to these we find in man's notion of God's relation to sin two prominent ideas, or rather a recognition of two attributes of God, which are manifested in His dealing with sin—the attributes of Love and Justice, or, as they are sometimes regarded, of Mercy and Truth. Here we meet one of the paradoxes of the doctrine of the Atonement, for throughout Revelation God is spoken of on the one hand as a God of Love and Mercy, and on the other hand of Truth and Justice. In the following passage these attributes are combined: When God passed before Moses He proclaimed, 'The Lord, The Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, *forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty*; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation.'[1]

IV. In addition to these three fundamental ideas which we trace everywhere in human nature, we must ask what is the essential idea of sacrifice itself.

i. We have seen that its *effects* are twofold, remedying the twofold effects of sin: the sense of alienation from God, and of guilt incurred. But we must not confuse the effects of sacrifice with its motive or

[1] Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7.

essential idea. While sacrifice has come to be associated with the expression of a sense of sin, the very opposite appears to have been its original and essential conception, for sacrifice appears at first to have been the expression of that love which sprang from man's original relation to God as His creature and child, the outcome of that union between God and man which was broken by sin.

Love existed before sin stained the human heart, and sacrifice in its essence is the effort of the human heart to express its love. We see this still, for sacrifice always is associated with love. The love of the mother for her child, what sacrifice it demands—of thought, of sorrow, of time, of strength, of pain! The love of man and woman, hallowed in holy matrimony, begins with sacrifice and demands sacrifices as long as it continues in this world. Under the hallowed blessing of the Church, that love issues in the one giving to the other everything—heart, thoughts, life. So our love for God is shown best and first by sacrifice. It has been thought that perhaps the skins, with which God clothed Adam and Eve as they left the Garden of Eden, tell of beasts slain and offered in sacrifice as symbols of the life derived from God, and thus in a figure given back to Him.

When the shadow of sin fell upon the earth, sacrifice became associated with the ideas of sin and penitence; but these are secondary ideas, and even these bear witness to the same fundamental idea of love; for there is no real penitence apart from love. Contrition is sorrow which has its root in the love of God. So that even in man's sinful state sacrifice bears witness to the root of love still left in the human heart. Men may offer sacrifice to propitiate God, to expiate sin, but beneath all is the fundamental conception of love, the longing for restored union with God.

ii. At a certain definite point in human history we find these fundamental ideas of sacrifice gathered up into the Mosaic code and distinctly expressed under sacrificial laws which, as we now see, pointed to and prepared the way for the one supreme and only perfect Sacrifice by which the world was to be redeemed, the Sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ upon the Cross. This is so absolutely evident to the Christian that no one can adequately treat of the Atonement without studying it as foreshadowed in the Jewish sacrifices.

In these, as indeed in the sacrifices of natural religion, we find two distinct parts, an inward and an outward part, not always present together, but always and necessarily united in order to constitute a *perfect* sacrifice; and the theological expression, 'Verum et proprium sacrificium,' bears witness to this.

1. The inward part. Sacrifice first finds expression in the human soul in inward acts, that is, in certain thoughts, religious emotions, and acts of the will. The very law of man's nature, however, requires that these inward feelings should be expressed by outward actions, since man consists not only of soul but also of body, and must worship God with his whole being. Sacrifice therefore demands outward actions, expressive of inward feelings and beliefs. The inward part, in a sense, is the more important, and may indeed be called the *true* sacrifice, inasmuch as without it there can be no true sacrifice. Yet this inward part alone is not a sacrifice *properly* so called.

2. The outward part. The sacrificial action, which alone can constitute a sacrifice, in the proper sense of the term belongs strictly to the outward part. While it ought to signify or express the inward feeling, yet it gains its character not from this, but from the authority by which it was instituted, which authority must come from God.

Hence, where the inward part is wanting—as, for instance, when the offerer approaches without right dispositions—there is a *proper* sacrifice, but not a *true* sacrifice. To constitute a *true* and *proper* sacrifice both parts must be combined.

We see in the history of religion the tendency and the danger of dissociating these two parts.[1] To have the outward without the inward leads to mere formalism, the body of religion without its soul; while to have the inward part without the outward ignores half man's nature and produces a religion which is dumb, in that it has no means of expressing itself.

In the books of the prophets we find the sternest denunciations of mere formalism in sacrifice, and passionate appeals to the Jews for those interior dispositions which make the sacrifice acceptable to God. 'To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. . . . Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto Me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies.'[2]

'I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.'[3] 'The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise.'[4]

These passages do not mean that God by them abrogated the sacrifices and incense which He had Himself commanded to be offered, but that He declared His detestation of the mere outward act of obedience unaccompanied by the true spirit of religion.

In our Blessed Lord we find every sacrificial idea fulfilled in its utmost perfection. The inward part, the true sacrifice, began with the first moment of His

[1] Cf. Mortimer, *Studies in Holy Scripture*, pp. 94-108.
[2] Isa. i. 11, 13. [3] Hosea vi. 6. [4] Ps. li. 17.

incarnate life. The loving obedience, the desire to do His Father's will, to accomplish His Father's work, was ever present in our Blessed Lord's life on earth, was ever seeking opportunities to express itself. Our Lord had always clearly before Him that supreme moment in which this inward disposition was to find its outward expression in a sacrificial action upon the Cross of Calvary. His most precious Death not only fulfilled the law of sacrifice revealed through Moses, but was an offering of such infinite value that by it the world was redeemed.

When we speak of the sacrifice of the death of Christ we must remember that this includes those inward dispositions which made the offering a perfect, that is, a *true* as well as a *proper* sacrifice. It was not the act of dying alone, but it was the life of love and obedience also which constituted our Lord's perfect sacrifice.

iii. We may observe that in our Lord's sacrifice He fulfilled the various stages and sacrifices set forth under the Jewish law.

1. First, the dedication of the victim by the offerer. 'If his offering be a burnt sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish: he shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle before the Lord.'[1] The dedication of the offering in our Lord's case has been variously seen in the institution of the Holy Eucharist, and in the great high-priestly prayer in S. John's Gospel, where our Lord says, 'For their sakes I consecrate Myself'; and also in the Garden of Gethsemane, 'O My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me: nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt.'[2]

2. The identification of the victim with the offerer: 'He shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him.'[3]

[1] Lev. i. 3. [2] S. Matt. xxvi. 39. [3] Lev. i. 4.

The victim under the law was a mere symbolical substitute for the offerer, but we must clearly realise that our Blessed Lord was in the truest sense representative of the human race. The Jewish victims were irrational creatures distinct from the person of the offerer. In Christ, on the contrary, the gift offered up is included in the Person of the offering priest. It is His living, human flesh, animated by His rational soul, and therefore, in the language of Scripture, a spiritual (πνευματική) and rational (λογική) offering. Hence the sacrificial victim offered by Christ is not a merely symbolic but a real and equivalent substitute for mankind, on whose behalf it is sacrificed. Besides, Christ was a victim of immaculate holiness, as we read: 'The precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.'[1]

Hence, under this head we may see that there was a real identity between the victim and the human race, for whom the victim was offered; and further, that the sacrifice was that of a sinless Man, and gained its infinite value from the hypostatic union, in that it was also the sacrifice of the Son of God. In placing his hand upon the head of the burnt offering the offerer expressed a transference to the victim not only of his sins, but of the inward disposition which alone could make the sacrifice acceptable to God. So in the sacrifice of the Cross our Lord not only bore the sins of the world, but offered in will His whole life, all His acts, all the devotion of a sinless and perfect life.

3. The effusion of blood. In the Jewish sacrifice, while the slaughtering of the victim was a part, the presentation of the blood was the essential act of the sacrifice. Some have supposed that the slaughtering of the victim was merely for the purpose of obtaining the blood which was to be offered. Others, with deeper appreciation of the mystery, see in the act of

[1] 1 S. Pet. i. 19.

death a recognition of the penal consequences of sin, and a special character therefore given to the blood—that, as the life was in it, and the life was offered, it was a life which had passed through death, a life which had paid the debt due to sin.

Here we come to the most important sacrificial action under the Jewish code. The blood by the Levitical law was sprinkled seven times before the veil of the sanctuary,[1] the veil, that is, which separated the holy place from the Holy of holies, and which signified 'that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest,'[2] free access to God being barred by man's sin; for within the Holy of holies was the Mercy-Seat, symbolical of God's presence.

Into the Holy of holies, and therefore into the presence of God, the high priest alone, the representative of the people, entered once a year. The fact that, although the blood of each victim was sprinkled towards the veil, it still remained unmoved, signified that the blood of the legal victim was not able to take away the effect of sin typified by the veil, that is, separation from God.

The priest then put some of the blood upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense which was in the holy place of the tabernacle of the congregation; after which he poured all the blood of the victim at the bottom of the altar of burnt offering which was at the entrance of the tabernacle of the congregation. This symbolic act seems to mean that the blood had been offered and *had failed* to remove the obstacle which barred free access to God. Some of the blood was then put on the horns of the altar to plead for the individual offerer, and the rest was poured at the bottom of the altar in token that it was powerless to take away the effect of sin.

In our Blessed Lord's sacrifice on the Cross we have

[1] Lev. iv. 5, 7. [2] Heb. ix. 8.

brought before us both the slaughter of the victim and the presentation of the blood. As all the blood of the victim was used in the sacrifice, so our Lord there shed all His precious Blood for us. But what the blood of the legal victim could never effect was at once accomplished by the precious Blood of Christ, for (unlike the sprinkling of the blood before the veil of the tabernacle) the effect of the shedding of our Lord's Blood was seen in the rending of the veil of the temple, thus showing that the sacrifice was efficacious, accepted by God for the pardon of man's sin, and that the way of access to God was opened.

There seems to be no other possible explanation of the rending of the veil of the temple. That veil had always stood as the symbol of separation from God. Once a year the high priest, the representative of the people, entered within it, to signify that the day should come when the true representative of humanity would enter for ever into the presence of God, through His own blood, and so become THE WAY[1] by which man might freely approach God. When therefore our Lord, 'by His one oblation of Himself once offered,' made upon the Cross 'a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world,'[2] we are explicitly told by all three of the Synoptists that 'the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom.'[3]

4. There is but one ceremony of the sacrificial rite still to be noticed, the cremation of the victim, which in the case of the burnt offering was wholly consumed upon the altar, while in that of the sin offering only certain parts of it were burnt. This action expressed the idea of the sacrifice ascending as a sweet savour before God. It was fulfilled in our Lord's sacrifice upon

[1] S. John x. 9; xiv. 6.
[2] Consecration Prayer.
[3] S. Matt. xxvii. 51; S. Mark xv. 38; S. Luke xxiii. 45.

the Cross, in that it was the great act of love of God for man, and in the fires of Divine love the sacrifice was consumed. So S. Paul says, 'Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a *sweet-smelling savour*.'[1] In this text the terms are distinctly sacrificial, and the words 'a sweet-smelling savour' evidently refer to the burnt offering of the Jews. On the altar of the Cross, therefore, the victim was consumed in the flames of Divine love.

Thus we see that in our Lord's sacrifice all the various stages and processes of the Jewish sacrificial code were accurately and precisely fulfilled. There remained, however, after the offering of the sacrificial act, its effect, the fruits of the sacrifice, Christ's merits, His great intercession in heaven, and on earth His sacrificed body, the food of man. These points, however, will be better treated under our Lord's ascended life.

V. It may be well to pause here to gather up the principal elements in our Lord's Atonement and Sacrifice.

1. First, there is the element of *Propitiation*. This is the distinct teaching of Holy Scripture, for S. Paul, writing to the Romans, speaks of 'All them that believe' as 'Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a *propitiation* through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God';[2] and S. John says, 'If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And He is the *propitiation* for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.'[3] And again, 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He

[1] Eph. v. 2. [2] Rom. iii. 22-25. [3] 1 S. John ii. 1, 2.

loved us, and sent His Son to be the *propitiation* for our sins.'[1]

If we ask what gave to the death of Christ its propitiatory value, we may answer in S. Bernard's words, 'It was not His death, but His willing acceptance of death, which was pleasing to God.' At each moment in death, as through life, our Lord's human will was exerted to keep Himself in union with the will of God. It was not a mere submission once for all, but a series of voluntary acts of resignation and obedience. This was that spirit of sacrifice which God asks, and which cannot be found in any offering of sinful man.

A further element of propitiation may be discerned in the death of our Lord, for the law of righteousness, which, in the justice of God, demands not only obedience in the present, but expiation for the past. The value of our Lord's propitiatory sacrifice, then, lay not only in His perfect obedience, the union of His human will with the will of God throughout His whole life, but also in its satisfaction of God's justice, the payment of the debt incurred by sin, the propitiation of the Divine wrath against sin by the death on the Cross, the acknowledgment of the justice of God's judgment on sin.

To these two considerations we must add a third—the frequent declarations of Holy Scripture, that it was necessary, that it behoved, Christ to die, point to something exceptional in His death; and there can be no question that death was a necessary factor in the idea of sacrifice for sin, and that the ceremonial of the slaying of the victim points to an expiatory significance in death itself.

2. Another element greatly misunderstood in regard to the Atonement is the *vicarious* character of our Blessed Lord's sufferings. It is indeed on this that cavillers have founded their charge of injustice and

[1] 1 S. John iv. 10.

immorality in the Church's teaching of the Atonement, for they say, How can it be just that an innocent person should suffer for a guilty one? How can the justice of God be satisfied with such a substitution?

Without pretending to make this mystery clear, we may point out three things which remove some of the difficulties involved in it.

(*a*) First, the circumstance that the Victim was a self-offered one, a willing victim, makes the greatest difference in regard to the question of injustice to the sufferer.

(*b*) Secondly, the principle of vicarious suffering is one which is to be found in life and nature always; the mother suffering for her child, the father paying his son's debts; but in these cases, as in the great fact which they illustrate, the vicarious suffering is of no moral advantage to him for whom it is borne, unless he distinctly appropriates it to himself by an act of his own. So, too, the mediation which obtains mercy for the criminal is ineffective, unless it produces also a change in him. In like manner, the vicarious suffering of Christ for our sins is of no value to us as individuals, unless we appropriate the merits of His passion by using the means of grace which flow from it.

(*c*) Thirdly, we must bear in mind that the substitution implied something more than a mere artificial relation between the Victim and him for whom He suffered. Our Lord Jesus Christ was our Representative, as we have already pointed out, from the fact that He had taken human nature into Himself; and this human nature was so real and so perfect that He was involved, so to speak, in all the consequences of the sin which is so tremendous a factor in human life—even the enduring of the very sufferings and death which in us are the penal results and final outcome of sin, but which in Him were the instruments of His free sacrifice.

Here is the true vicariousness of the Atonement, which consisted not in the mere substitution of His punishment for ours, but in His offering the Sacrifice which man had neither the purity nor the power to offer.

3. Another element of the sacrifice of Christ is its power to restore the broken union between God and man, both by reconciling us to God and by reconciling God to us: the first by delivering us from the sin which separated us absolutely from God; the second by conveying to us the Divine gift of life which had been forfeited by sin.

By the imparted righteousness of Christ through the Sacraments, and the appropriation of these through the co-operation of the human will, man is enabled, as it were, to weave into his very character the righteousness of Christ, and so to obtain 'the wedding garment required of God in Holy Scripture.'

The sacrifice of our Blessed Lord which was once for all offered on the Cross (for the Cross is the only absolute sacrifice) is perpetuated, not repeated, in a memorial sacrifice instituted by our Lord Himself the night before He died, the Holy Eucharist. In this sacrifice He is mystically immolated in an unbloody manner.

This sacrifice is not a repetition of the sacrifice of Calvary, but is identical with it; for it is altogether the same in its nature as that which our Lord offered upon the Cross. For there is offered the same Lamb of God Who on the Cross offered Himself to take away the sins of the world, the same Body which was born of Mary and crucified on Calvary, the same precious Blood which was there shed, and there is present the same Priest (though now acting mediately) and the same Victim.

It has its differences, but they belong not so much to the essence of the sacrifice as to the *mode* in which it is

offered. On the Cross our Lord offered visibly to God His Body and His precious Blood; in the Eucharist He offers, under the form of the bread and wine, that Body which is no longer visible to our earthly eyes (because it possesses the qualities of a resurrection body, that is, it has been glorified), but which will be visible to us when we, like Him, are risen from the dead. On the Cross He Himself 'immediately' as High Priest consecrated a sacrifice of expiation. In the Eucharist He is still the Priest, but 'mediately,' through the priest of the Church. On the Cross there was an actual immolation of the Lamb; it was a bloody sacrifice. In the Eucharist there is a mystical immolation; it is an unbloody sacrifice; for, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Christ, but in this there is no bloodshed, nor pain, nor death.

Thus the Atonement is a culmination of the Incarnation, but it requires the Resurrection and Ascension for its completion, for its effects or fruits to be produced. These fruits are conveyed to us chiefly through the Sacraments, by which the merits of the Sacrifice of Christ are applied to individuals.

While our Lord offered His Sacrifice for humanity, to take away the sins of the world, yet for the individual there must be a real personal union with Christ in order that he may appropriate these benefits, that is, there must be not only a participation in sacrificial rites, but that inward disposition which is necessary to every true sacrifice.[1]

[1] Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, chaps ii. and iii.

CHAPTER V

ARTICLE V

He descended into hell; the third day He rose again from the dead.—*Apostles' Creed.*

And the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures. —*Nicene Creed.*

Descended into hell; rose again the third day from the dead.—*Athanasian Creed.*

I. Of our Lord's Descent into Hell.

This clause is first found in Western Creeds in that of the Church of Aquileia as given by Rufinus, who points out that in his day it was not in the Roman Creed. The influence of S. Ambrose, who was the moving spirit of a Council held at Aquileia in 381 (presided over by S. Valerian, Bishop of Aquileia), has led some to associate its introduction with S. Ambrose. It is, however, found, though not in the same words, in the early Creed of Jerusalem as given by S. Cyril.[1] It is also found in the Athanasian Creed.

i. The word 'hell' in this place does not represent a place of torment. It is the equivalent of the

[1] 'He descended to the regions beneath the earth, that from thence also He might redeem the just. For, tell me, wouldest thou that the living should enjoy His grace, and this when most of them are unholy, but that those who from Adam have been for a long while imprisoned should not now obtain deliverance.'—S. Cyr. Hier., *Cat.* iv. 11; Migne, *P. G.* xxxiii. col. 169.

Greek 'Hades,' of the Hebrew 'Sheol,' and of the Latin 'infernum,' 'inferna,' or 'inferos.' (The last word is used in the present form of the Apostles' Creed and in the Athanasian Creed.) 'Hades,' the Greek form, is frequently used in the New Testament, and is carefully distinguished from 'gehenna' and other words implying torment or punishment. It simply means the abode of the departed, and, so far as the word itself is concerned, implies nothing as to their state of happiness or misery, although Hades is now seldom used for the abode of the lost.

With this Article of the Creed we associate certain passages of Holy Scripture: 'For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: *by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison*; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.'[1]

'Moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption. . . . He, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that His soul was not left in hell, neither His flesh did see corruption.'[2] 'Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise.'[3]

Of these passages the first is the most difficult of interpretation, and while it clearly tells us that our Lord by the Spirit went and preached unto the spirits in prison, there is not sufficient consensus in regard to its precise meaning to enable us to use it. Of the other two passages we shall speak later on.

As the word 'buried' was probably introduced into

[1] 1 S. Pet. iii. 18, 19, 20. [2] Acts ii. 26, 27, 31.
[3] S. Luke xxiii. 43.

the Creed to refute the heresy of the Docetæ, who asserted that our Lord was only in appearance dead, so probably the words 'descended into hell' may have been directed against the Apollinarians, whose heresy (that our Lord had no human soul)[1] was dealt with in the Council of Constantinople (381), and is also refuted in the words of the Athanasian Creed: 'Perfect God and perfect Man, *of a reasonable soul* and human flesh subsisting.'

That we may clearly understand the relation in which our Lord's Body and Soul stood to His Divine Person after His death, and the reason that His flesh did not see corruption, we may observe that in Christ were two unions, one personal or hypostatic, the other vital. In regard to the first, the Divine Person of God the Word was personally united to our Lord's human nature, that is, to His Body and Soul, and this union, which can never be severed, is called the Hypostatic union.

Besides this, as man, a vital union existed between our Lord's Body and Soul. This of course was severed at the moment of death, but death could not interrupt the Hypostatic union, so that our Lord's Body while it lay in the tomb was still hypostatically united to the Person of God the Word, and, in the same way, His Soul in the Intermediate state retained its full personal relation to God the Word.

Our Lord's descent into Hades, while a very mysterious revelation, is an important one. It is generally held that in addition to the fulfilment of all the conditions of humanity (one of which is for the soul after death to pass into Hades), the object of our Lord's descent into hell was to free the souls of the patriarchs and the holy dead of the Old Testament, according to the prophecy of Zechariah: 'By the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of

[1] Cf. p. 145.

the pit wherein is no water. Turn you to the stronghold, ye prisoners of hope.'[1] These, the Western Church teaches, were in the Limbus Patrum ('Limbus' means a fringe, hence the borderland of Hades or hell). This would correspond with the Paradise which our Lord promised to the penitent robber.[2] It was so called because it was a place of rest and joy, though the joy was imperfect. In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus[3] our Lord speaks of it as 'Abraham's bosom,' using the Rabbinical name.

ii. In this Article of the Creed we profess a belief in an intermediate state, in regard to the *existence* of which Holy Scripture is quite clear, though it tells us but little about its nature and conditions.

We must observe, first, that the intermediate state was altogether changed by our Lord's triumph over death; so that terms and ideas which might be gathered from the Old Testament, or even the New Testament before our Lord's Ascension, can no longer be used in the same sense after it. For the Christian the Intermediate state is not Abraham's bosom, for this was a Rabbinical name which implied association with the patriarch Abraham as its highest privilege. Neither can we accurately term it 'Paradise,' although it is very commonly spoken of under this name. The word 'Paradise' occurs three times only in the New Testament: in the passage which we have quoted, where our Lord promises it to the penitent robber; in the Epistle to the Corinthians, where S. Paul, describing his visions, tells us that he was 'caught up to the third heaven,' and 'that he was caught up into Paradise.'[4] The third passage is in the Book of Revelation, 'To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God.'[5]

[1] Zech. ix. 11, 12. [2] S. Luke xxiii. 43. [3] S. Luke xvi. 23.
[4] 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4. [5] Rev. ii. 7.

In the first passage 'Paradise' does refer to the Intermediate state, because our Lord was there. The promise was, 'to be *with Me* in Paradise.' But when our Lord left the Intermediate state and rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven, that state was no longer Paradise, for our Lord was no longer there.

In the second passage it seems quite evident that S. Paul is not speaking of the Intermediate state, for Paradise appears to be equivalent to the third heaven; and in the last passage there can be no doubt whatever that the Paradise which S. John is describing is heaven itself, for the same imagery is used twice[1] in the last chapter of Revelation, which contains the fullest description of heaven.

Tertullian is commonly quoted as using the name 'Paradise' for the Intermediate state. This is quite incorrect, as he most distinctly confines Paradise to martyrs only, making it the altar of heaven, under which S. John saw the souls of them that were slain.[2] All other souls he most positively consigns to a place under the earth. His words are, 'You must suppose Hades to be a subterranean region and keep at arms' length those who are too proud to believe that the souls of the faithful deserve a place in the lower regions. . . . How is it that the region of Paradise, which was revealed to S. John in the Spirit, and lay under the altar, displays no other soul in it besides the souls of the martyrs?'[3]

The term 'Intermediate state' is used in two senses, generally for the abode of those who are *not lost*, but who have not attained to the vision of God; hence a state intermediate between heaven and hell. In this sense it is used by Catholic theologians. Others, however, by 'Intermediate state' understand the

[1] Rev. xxii. 2, 14. [2] Cf. Rev. vi. 9, 10.
[3] Tert., *De Anima*, cap. lv.; Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 744-746.

state of all between the moment of death and the day of judgment. These do not generally admit that any of the saints have attained to the vision of God, or are in heaven; so that for them 'Intermediate state' would include the lost as well as the saved, in fact all souls that have departed this life, whether in grace or in sin.

Before we speak of the three principal views of the Intermediate state we must draw attention to the doctrine of the particular judgment which is practically held by all theologians. It is that at the moment of death the soul is in some way judged and its future decided. This seems absolutely necessary if we believe the soul to be conscious after it leaves the body; for, if conscious, it must either go to a place of preparation for heaven, if saved, or to the abode of the lost, if not saved. But this involves a judgment. This particular judgment does not, however, in any way supersede the general judgment at the last day, and is only for the purpose of deciding the state of the soul when it leaves the body.

iii. In regard to the Intermediate state there are, and have been, three principal views:

1. The Eastern Church teaches that at the moment of death all souls pass either into heaven or into hell; though they hold 'that neither the just nor the wicked receive the full recompense of their deeds before the final day of judgment.'[1] For them there is no Intermediate state, as their greatest modern theologian says: 'According to the Orthodox Church, there is after death no intermediate class at all between those who are saved and go to heaven, and those who are condemned and go to Hades. There is no particular intermediate place where the souls of those, who before their death were penitent, are found and become the object of the Church's prayers. All these souls go into Hades, from

[1] Conf. Orth., *Quest.* 61.

whence they can be delivered only by the prayers of the Church.'[1]

Bishop Macarius, at one time rector of the Theological Academy at St. Petersburg, afterwards Patriarch of Moscow, is the author of the principal modern work on the Dogmatic Theology of the Greek Church. His book, which was written in Russian, may be had in an authorised translation in Greek, and has also been translated into French. In the French translation the words which we have rendered into 'Hades' are 'en enfer,' and the context shows that he means the place of the lost, for he explicitly excludes any intermediate class or intermediate place between heaven and hell.

It is quite true that there are now in the Greek Church, and have been in the past, some who have held a very different doctrine from this, viz. that no souls pass either into heaven or hell until after the day of judgment. This, we may observe, is precisely the opposite to what Macarius says; and, while held by some individuals, it is not borne out by the authoritative declaration of the Greek Church or by its service-books, as is well shown by Leo Allatius.

While the Easterns explicitly rejected the doctrine of Purgatory, their own view does not differ greatly from it, for they consign all imperfect souls to a place of torment, from which 'those who before leaving this present life have repented, but have not had time to bring forth fruits meet for repentance . . . have still the possibility of attaining an alleviation of their sufferings, and even a complete liberation from the chains of Hades.'[2] This is accomplished by the prayers and alms of the faithful, and especially the offering of the holy sacrifice. Where this differs from the Western doctrine of Purgatory is in that the Western Theo-

[1] Macaire, *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe*, vol. ii. p. 729.
[2] Macaire, *ibid.* p. 103.

logians distinguish between the abode of those who are lost and those who are being purified, and teach that the object of the sufferings of Purgatory is to satisfy the justice of God; while the Easterns make the sufferings depend upon the fact that, while the soul began really to do penance upon earth, it had not time to complete its work of penance before God called it away.

2. The second view starts with the assumption that no souls can pass into heaven, that is, into the Beatific vision, before the day of judgment. Its adherents call the Intermediate state 'Paradise' and in it place all the faithful dead. This view is held by some in our own Communion. It is not a modern error; indeed, there have been traces of it in almost all ages; but it was reserved for Pope John XXII., who died in the year 1334, to set it forth in the form of a definite doctrine.[1] It was condemned, and John is said to have recanted. His view was especially that the saints would not enjoy the Beatific vision of the Holy Trinity until after the last day. This is contrary to the teaching of the great majority of theologians, and indeed no great name can be quoted in its support.

3. The ordinary Western view is, that at the moment of death those who are lost pass at once into hell. Those who die in a state of grace, but not free from imperfection, pass into a state of purification, and when they have become perfect enter heaven, that is, into the Beatific vision.

All three views practically admit of some form of purification in the Intermediate state, the Western view in addition teaching that as soon as the soul is ready for the presence of God it passes into that presence. All alike, however, teach that after the day of the general judgment, when the soul is re-united

[1] Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.* liv. xciv. chap. xxi.; tom. xix. p. 479, ed. Paris, 1740.

to the body, there will be an increment to its joy, even though it has already entered upon the Beatific vision.[1]

II. Of our Lord's Resurrection.

i. The importance of the doctrine of our Lord's resurrection may be gathered from its prominence in the teaching of the Apostles. The preaching of S. Paul at Athens is summed up in the words, 'He preached unto them *Jesus, and the resurrection.*'[2] This clause contains his whole Gospel.

In the choice of an apostle to fill the place of Judas S. Peter sums up the apostolic office in the phrase, 'One must be ordained to be a witness with us of His resurrection.'[3] And in his first sermon on the day of Pentecost he twice refers to the resurrection of Christ in the words, 'Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it.' And, 'He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that His soul was not left in hell, neither His flesh did see corruption.'[4] And indeed throughout the Acts and the Epistles[5] the references to our Lord's resurrection show that it was regarded as a fundamental doctrine of Christianity.

In each of the four Gospels also it is the culmination of the Gospel record, the Ascension being referred to only in a few words by S. Luke and S. Mark (if we accept the last verses as belonging to S. Mark), and finding no place in S. Matthew and S. John.

[1] The author would venture to refer, for a fuller treatment of this mysterious subject, to his *Catholic Faith and Practice*, part ii. pp. 330-452.

[2] Acts xvii. 18. [3] Acts i. 22. [4] Acts ii. 24, 31.

[5] Acts i. 3; iii. 26; iv. 10, 33; x. 40; xiii. 30; xvii. 3, 31, 32; xxiii. 6; xxv. 19; xxvi. 23; Rom. i. 4; iv. 24, 25; vi. 4, 9; viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 15, 17; Phil. iii. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 8; 1 S. Pet. i. 3; iii. 21.

In a sense the resurrection of Christ is indeed the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, for without it, as S. Paul says, our faith is vain and we are yet in our sins, and they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.[1] It was a proof of our Lord's Godhead and of the truth of His words, 'No man taketh it (my life) from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.'[2] And, 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.'[3] It was also a pledge of our own resurrection.

It has been objected that others have been raised from the dead both in the record of the Old and New Testaments: the son of the widow of Zarephath by Elijah,[4] the son of the Shunammite by Elisha,[5] the dead man raised to life by contact with the bones of Elisha;[6] and in the New Testament, the daughter of Jairus,[7] the son of the widow of Nain,[8] and Lazarus.[9] But these were only raised in their natural bodies, and died again. Our Lord arose in His glorified body, and death had no more dominion over Him.[10]

Others rose in their natural bodies to live for a while longer a life under the conditions of the ordinary life of this world; but our Lord's risen body possessed the properties of a glorified body. It was impassible; death had no more dominion over it. It was all glorious, although on account of His apostles' weakness our Lord veiled this glory when He appeared to them.

S. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians teaches us that this was one of the properties of the resurrection bodies.[11] It was subtile, in that it could pass through closed doors and through the stone of the tomb. And

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 17, 18.
[2] S. John x. 18.
[3] S. John ii. 19.
[4] 1 Kings xvii. 22.
[5] 2 Kings iv. 34.
[6] 2 Kings xiii. 21.
[7] S. Luke viii. 54.
[8] S. Luke vii. 14.
[9] S. John xi. 43.
[10] Rom. vi. 9.
[11] 1 Cor. xv. 43.

it was agile. As a spiritual body it could pass from place to place with the swiftness of thought. It did not need the ordinary supplies of food, though our Lord did eat in order to convince His disciples of His physical identity.[1]

ii. It is not necessary here to investigate all the evidences of the fact of our Lord's resurrection. We may, however, notice the incredulity of the witnesses and the abundant character of the evidence which S. Paul adduces. Unbelievers, in denying the fact of our Lord's resurrection, often do not deny the historical witness of the apostles and other disciples, but say that they were credulous and had been led to expect a resurrection, whereas the Gospel narrative shows us that precisely the opposite was the fact; not one even of the apostles, apparently, expected our Lord to rise again. Even S. John was only convinced when he entered the tomb and beheld the grave-clothes; and the two disciples who walked with our Lord to Emmaus, while they bore witness to the testimony of the women at the sepulchre, showed no signs of accepting it. They felt probably, with the apostles, that their words were idle tales. Indeed, each of the Evangelists expressly tells us that at first they believed not.[2]

S. Paul, in his great treatise on the resurrection, in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, takes special pains to marshal the evidence for the fact of our Lord's resurrection before he goes on to deduce from that fact its moral consequences for Christianity. He points out that our Lord 'was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that, He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After

[1] S. Luke xxiv. 41-43.
[2] S. Matt. xxviii. 17; S. Mark xvi. 11; S. Luke xxiv. 11; S. John xx. 9.

that, He was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all He was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time.'[1]

S. Paul thus shows that at the time when he wrote this Epistle to the Corinthians there were more than two hundred and fifty witnesses of the resurrection still alive, and that there had been over five hundred. Upon this fact he bases the hope of our own resurrection from the dead, and from it he deduces certain great moral consequences in the lives of Christians, that a belief in the doctrine of the resurrection must lead to a life of righteousness.

iii. But besides this, we observe that a special work in man's salvation is associated with our Lord's resurrection, the great work of justification: 'Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.'[2] And, 'If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; *ye are yet in your sins.*'[3]

Justification is the most important event in Christian life, for it is the act by which sinful man is changed from an enemy to the friend of God; from a child of wrath to a child of God; from the natural man to the spiritual man. As S. Paul describes it, 'If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.'[4]

We see, therefore, that it is the most glorious privilege conferred upon us by God through the merits of Christ, and especially associated with His resurrection. 'Justification consists in the remission of sin and in the infusion of grace, and is thus both a forensic act and a spiritual process within the soul. Yet these processes are not two, but one, as the illumination of space and the dispersion of darkness is one and the same thing.'[5]

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 5-9.
[2] Rom. iv. 25.
[3] 1 Cor. xv. 17.
[4] 2 Cor. v. 17.
[5] Forbes, *Explanation of the Nicene Creed*, p. 231.

The word 'to justify' (δικαιοῦν) in the New Testament does often mean, not to make, but to pronounce just, by legal sentence; but we must remember that for God to declare a man just is to make him just, for God's voice effects what it says, as we read, 'He spake the word and they were made; He commanded, and they were created.'[1] So that this imputation of righteousness to the sinner, or *declaring* him to be just, *makes* him just, for when God declares a fact He makes it a fact by declaring it. This surely is the teaching of all Scripture. In the beginning God said, 'Let there be light: and there was light.'[2] Our Lord said to the leper, 'Be thou clean,' and the leprosy departed. He commanded the evil spirits, and they obeyed. God's word is in all cases an instrument of His deed. When He utters the command, 'Let the soul be just,' it becomes just, although we must carefully observe the conditions and means of its justification.

Luther invented a doctrine of justification which is absolutely immoral. He taught that a man was justified by being declared and reputed righteous, the merits of Christ being made over to him by what we may term a legal fiction; so that, according to Lutheran theology, man is not made righteous, but simply reputed to be righteous by a sort of legal fiction, his sinfulness remaining, but being covered as with a cloak by the righteousness of Christ.

Indeed, the Lutheran school teaches the strange paradox that God's calling us righteous implies not only that we are not, but that we never shall be righteous; that is to say, that a thing is not, because God says it is, that the solemn averment of the living and true God is inconsistent with the fact averred, that the glory of God's pronouncing us righteous lies in His leaving us unrighteous, and this in spite of the statement, 'I will not justify the wicked.'[3]

[1] Ps. cxlviii. 5. [2] Gen. i. 3. [3] Exod. xxiii. 7; cf. xxxiv. 7.

While there is a sense in which righteousness is imputed (or reckoned) to us, it is because it is also imparted to us. The merits of Christ are the meritorious cause of our righteousness, but they are *really* ours by impartation, not *fictitiously* ours by imputation only. In a derived sense, but a most true one, the term 'justification' is used for actual righteousness, since this is the result of being justified; for since justification consists in the renewal of the soul of man, that renewal is justification. Thus justification and sanctification are substantially the same thing, though the same thing viewed from two different standpoints.

1. We will now give a brief definition of justification. Justification is not only the remission of sins, but also sanctification, or the renewal of the inner man by voluntary acceptance of grace and of the gifts which it imparts; so that a man, from being unrighteous, becomes righteous; from being at enmity with God, becomes a friend of God and 'an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.'

Here we notice four things:

(*a*) That the *negative* element of justification is the remission of sins.

(*b*) That the *positive* element is sanctification, an inward renewal.

(*c*) That the *means* of justification is the voluntary acceptance of it.

(*d*) That its *effect* is to make a man righteous, the friend of God, and an inheritor of heaven.

2. Hence we may say that there are five causes of justification:

(*a*) The *final* cause. This is threefold, namely, the glory of God, the glory of Christ, and the salvation of the justified.

(*b*) The *efficient* cause. This is the mercy of God, Who freely cleanses and sanctifies us, sealing and

anointing us with the Holy Ghost, the pledge of our eternal inheritance.

(*c*) The *meritorious* cause, which is the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who on the Cross redeemed us, making satisfaction for our sins to God the Father.

(*d*) The *instrumental* cause. This is primarily the sacrament of Baptism, but does not exclude other sacraments as instruments of justification.

(*e*) The *formal* cause, which is the righteousness of God; not the righteousness by which God is righteous, but that by which He makes us righteous, that which He imparts to us.

3. To this we may add that the *internal instrument* or *means* of justification is faith, and that justification consists

(*a*) In the remission of sins.

(*b*) In the bestowal of grace, that is, infusion of sanctifying or habitual grace, which inheres intrinsically in the soul.

4. The effects of justification are:

(*a*) That it renders us pleasing to God and makes us His friends, for our Lord said, 'Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you.'[1]

(*b*) It makes us children of God by adoption, and therefore inheritors of heaven. By the term 'adoption' we distinguish between ourselves and our Lord, Who is the only begotten Son of God by generation. We are accepted in Him, and therefore, as it were, adopted into the family of God.

(*c*) Justification makes us partakers of the divine nature, for we read, 'Beloved, now are we the sons of God, but it doth not yet appear what we shall be;

[1] S. John xv. 15.

but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is.'[1] And, 'Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises; that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruptions that are in the world through lust.'[2] And again, 'Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.'[3] Here grace is spoken of as the 'seed of God,' or 'seed of Divinity,' and as a seed virtually contains a new plant like the first, so grace has in itself the virtue of making us God-like.

(*d*) By justification the righteous man is made the temple of the Holy Ghost and of the Holy Trinity. This indwelling is common to the three Persons of the Holy Trinity;[4] but notwithstanding in a special mode it is referred to the Holy Ghost, because the work of sanctification, which is common to all three Persons, is attributed particularly to Him Whose special mission it is to sanctify the soul.[5]

4. We must further notice that in Holy Scripture our Lord's resurrection is closely associated with our own spiritual resurrection. S. Paul says, 'If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above. . . . For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.'[6] And in our Baptismal Office we are told that 'Baptism doth represent unto us our profession; which is, to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto Him; that, as He died, and rose again for us, so should we, who are baptized, die from sin, and rise again unto righteousness; continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily

[1] 1 S. John iii. 2. [2] 2 S. Pet. i. 4. [3] 1 S. John iii. 9.
[4] S. John xiv. 23; 1 Cor. vi. 19; iii. 17.
[5] For further study of the difficult but important question of Justification the reader is referred to the author's *Catholic Faith and Practice*, part ii. chap. ix. [6] Col. iii. 1, 3.

proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living.'[1] And the very act of Baptism administered by immersion, in which the catechumen descended into the water and came up again out of it, was considered to typify the death and resurrection of that Lord with Whom he was now mystically united by Baptism.

Public Baptism of Infants.

CHAPTER VI

ARTICLE VI

He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.—*Apostles' Creed.*

And ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father.—*Nicene Creed.*

He ascended into heaven, He sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty.—*Athanasian Creed.*

Of the Ascension, Session, and Reign of our Lord.

The Ascension of Jesus Christ into heaven is the last of those glorious mysteries of redemption, which in the Apostles' Creed are associated with the historic life of our Blessed Lord, and are commemorated on five great days of the Church's Year. On the Feast of the Annunciation we celebrate our Lord's Conception by the Holy Ghost; on Christmas Day, His Birth of the Virgin Mary; on Good Friday, His suffering under Pontius Pilate; on Easter Day, His resurrection from the dead; and on the Feast of the Ascension, His glorious Ascension into heaven.

I. The Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ was the exaltation of humanity, the joyous consummation of the work begun on the Feast of the Annunciation, the end of the humiliations and sufferings of the Son of Man, the final triumph of goodness; and yet it tells of the continuity of life, for it was the same Jesus, the

Son of Mary, Who had lived and died on earth, Who was exalted into heaven. That life of sorrow but of wondrous beauty finds its fruition in a better world than this, but it is the same life; death has not altered it, it has only freed it from the trammels of earth.

And the Ascension inaugurates our Lord's reign of blessing. S. Luke tells us, 'He lifted up His hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while He blessed them, He was parted from them, and carried up into heaven.'[1] The last sight of Him is with His hands raised in blessing; and so we now live under the benediction of those uplifted hands, for 'When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men,'[2] the first and greatest of the gifts, that which He had promised, the gift of the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, and through His operation in the Church, all other spiritual gifts and graces, the Sacraments, and all the treasures of the Church.

II. Of our Lord's three offices as Prophet, Priest, and King, the first is now exercised only through the teaching office of His Church on earth, but our Lord's Priestly and Kingly offices abide still in heaven. It was said of Him in prophecy, 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou at my right hand, . . . Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.'[3] And this passage forms the basis of the explication of our Lord's Royal Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews.[4] It will be seen from a study of the Epistle to the Hebrews that the Melchizedekan priesthood is contrasted with the Levitical priesthood.

In the first place, Melchizedek combined the two offices of priest and king, for we read that he was 'king of Salem' and 'the priest of the Most High God';[5] so that he foreshadowed our Lord's double office in

[1] S. Luke xxiv. 50, 51. [2] Eph. iv. 8. [3] Ps. cx. 1, 4.
[4] Heb. v., vi., vii. [5] Gen. xiv. 18.

His heavenly life. The Epistle to the Hebrews shows that the priesthood of our Lord was prefigured in the priesthood of Melchizedek *before* the legal covenant had any existence.

From this the writer draws a contrast between the universal and eternal nature of Christ's priesthood and the local and transitory character of the Levitical priesthood. He contrasts, too, the sacrifices which were offered daily by the Levitical priests, and yearly by the high priest (which by their very reiteration implied their imperfection), with the one, full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction once offered by our Lord on the Cross for the sins of the whole world.

III. The two points upon which the writer of the Epistle especially dwells with regard to our Lord's sacrifice are:

(1) That it was offered once for all, and being perfect, in that it effected its purpose, needs not to be repeated; and

(2) That its merits live on in heaven in the great Mediatorial work of Christ, upon His throne of glory.

In the priesthood of Melchizedek we may notice:

(1) Its universal character as contrasted with the national character of the Jewish priesthood.

(2) That the only offering implied is one of bread and wine.

The Fathers, from Clement of Alexandria[1] and S. Cyprian[2] downward, have assumed that the bread and wine were the materials of a sacrifice offered by Melchizedek, and S. Jerome[3] distinctly states that

[1] Clem. Alex., *Strom.* iv. 25; Migne, *P. G.* viii. col. 1369.

[2] *Ep. ad. Cæcil.* lxiii. 4; Migne, *P. L.* iv. col. 376.

[3] Jer., *In Matt.* xxii. 41; cf. also xxvi. 26; Migne, *P. L.* xxvi. col. 167 *et* 195.

they were offered for Abraham. The account in Genesis is not so explicit, and the fact that in the Epistle to the Hebrews the gifts of bread and wine are not mentioned Bishop Westcott thinks very significant, as indicating that Melchizedek is represented as priest, not in sacrificing, but in blessing, that is, in communicating the fruits of an efficacious sacrifice *already* made.

If we adopt the opinion that the bread and wine had already been offered in sacrifice, it falls in well with the view of our Lord's Intercession, that He is now in heaven pleading and dispensing on earth the fruits of His sacrifice once offered on the Cross.

Furthermore, in regard to our Lord's sacrifice, we are told 'He hath no need daily . . . to offer up sacrifices . . . for this He did *once for all* (ἐφάπαξ) when He offered up Himself,'[1] but that being 'holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and become higher than the heavens,' He is able to save to the uttermost them that come unto God through Him, seeing that He ever liveth to make intercession for them.[2]

There is here not only no mention of the offering of sacrifice, but this is explicitly excluded by the statement that He 'hath no need daily to offer up sacrifice' either 'for Himself' or 'for the people,' 'for this He did *once for all*, in that He offered up Himself.' This certainly seems purposely to exclude from the idea of Intercession or Mediation the offering of any *actual* sacrifice in heaven, and to show that it is based upon, or is the fruits of, the one sacrifice offered once for all upon the Cross.

IV. In addition to our Lord's Priesthood being 'after the order of Melchizedek,' the Epistle sets it forth as fulfilling the office of the Jewish high priest, and

[1] Heb. vii. 27. [2] Heb. vii. 24, 25.

draws certain comparisons and contrasts between our Lord's work and that of the high priest on the Day of Atonement.

i. The office of a *priest* is to offer sacrifices. The special function of the *high* priest was once a year to enter into the Holy of holies, thus foreshadowing our Lord's entry into heaven as our great Intercessor.

On certain great public occasions, as on the Day of Atonement, the high priest offered the sacrifice; but it may be questioned whether this was not rather on account of his dignity, and the representative and public character of the service on that day, than from any special power inherent in his office, as *high* priest, to offer sacrifice. The special function of the high priest, as we have said, appears to have been confined to entering into the Holy of holies, wearing the breastplate on which were written the names of the tribes of Israel, and thus appearing in the presence of God for the people.

We may perhaps illustrate this by a comparison of the offices of priest and bishop in the Christian Church. It is the office of a priest to offer the Holy Eucharist, and, though on representative and public occasions the bishop would naturally be the celebrant, no one supposes that he thereby imparts any greater efficacy to the sacrifice offered than if it had been offered by a priest, since a bishop celebrates the Holy Eucharist not as bishop, but as priest. The function peculiar to the episcopate is to administer the sacraments of Holy Orders and Confirmation.

ii. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the action of the Jewish high priest in the ritual of the Day of Atonement is put in parallel with our Lord's atoning work and His ascension into heaven, and our attention is directed both to the likeness and to the contrast between them. We find that the points of resemblance (chiefly in chapter ix.) are four:

(1) The entry into the Holy of holies of the high priest *alone*. So we as priests offer the sacrifice which Christ has commanded us to offer, but He alone has entered within the veil.

(2) 'Not without blood,'[1] that is, not apart from blood (*χωρὶς αἵματος*). We observe here how carefully the inspired writer avoids the phrase '*with* blood' (*μεθ' αἵματος*), since in this the high priest *differs* from our Lord in His entry, as is afterwards noted.

(3) 'To appear in the presence of God for us.'[2] The Fathers speak of the very presence of our Lord's humanity at the right hand of the Father as His Intercession, and they point out that this Intercession is not merely verbal prayer. Surely this too is typified by the fact that the high priest within the veil uttered no words, but bore upon his heart the breastplate engraved with the names of the tribes of Israel.

(4) The multitude waiting without for the high priest's return. So we are told of our Lord that He 'shall appear a second time apart from sin for them that wait for Him unto salvation.'[3]

The points of difference and contrast are even more strongly emphasised. They are chiefly three:

(1) That whereas the high priest entered into the Holy of holies many times, and with the blood of many victims, our Lord '*once for all* at the close of the ages hath been manifested to disannul sin by the sacrifice of Himself.' This contrast is dwelt upon again and again and brought out by the use of *ἅπαξ* and *ἐφάπαξ*.[4]

(2) That our Lord did not, like the high priest, enter a holy place made with hands, but into heaven itself.

(3) That whereas the high priest entered *with* (*ἐν*

[1] Heb. ix. 7.
[2] Heb. ix. 24.
[3] Heb. ix. 28.
[4] Heb. vii. 27; ix. 12, 26; x. 10.

αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ)[1] blood not his own, our Lord entered *through* (διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος) His own blood.

Thus the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews would teach us, that as under the Jewish law things were atoned or reconciled by the application of the blood of the sacrifice *which had been offered*, so the application of the precious Blood of Christ, shed and offered once for all upon the Cross, avails for ever as a propitiation and for the cleansing of sin.

iii. We may sum up, therefore, the principal points of the argument of the Epistle.

1. That our Lord's offering of Himself was made once for all upon the Cross.

2. That His entrance into heaven was *through* His Blood, not *with* it, as in the case of the high priest.

3. That the fruits of His sacrifice are to be seen in His work of Intercession.

This work of Intercession is simply our Lord's appearance in the presence of God for us, for Christ is entered 'into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.'[2]

The Fathers consistently explain our Lord's Intercession in this way: We read in S. Chrysostom, 'Do not then, having heard that He is a priest, suppose that He is always offering sacrifice, for He offered sacrifice once for all, and thenceforward sat down.'[3]

Theodoret says, 'But Christ is now a priest sprung from Judah according to the flesh, Himself not offering anything, but acting as the Head of those who offer. For He calls the Church His Body, and through her exercises His priesthood as man, but as God receives those things which are offered. For the Church offers

[1] ἐν with the dative in general use is applied to that with which one is furnished, which he brings with him. Cf. Winer, part III. 48.

[2] Cf. Heb. ix. 24.

S. Chrys., *In Heb.*, Hom. xiii. 3; Migne, *P. G.* lxiii. col. 107.

the symbols of His Body and Blood, sanctifying the whole lump by the first-fruits.'[1]

Euthymius Zigadenus writes, 'These [the Levitical priests], indeed, offered sacrifice daily throughout their whole life, but Christ offered sacrifice once for all.' And again, 'His very human nature therefore pleads with the Father on our behalf.'[2]

Turning from the Greek to the Latin Fathers, Primasius expresses this idea thus: 'In this Intercession it is affirmed that as true and eternal High Priest He shows and offers to the Father, as our pledge, man taken into Himself and for ever glorified.' And again, 'But He intercedes for us in this very fact, that He took human nature for us, which He continually presents to the Father for us.'[3]

And S. Gregory writes, 'To intercede for man is for the only begotten Son to present Himself as man in the presence of the co-eternal Father; and to plead for human nature is for Him to have taken that same nature into the exaltation of His Divinity.'[4]

Our Lord's Intercession as sacrificial may be spoken of as a *virtual* sacrifice, because it depends upon the sacrifice of the Cross; but it is not an *actual* sacrifice, because there is in it no sacrificial act. Some modern theologians speak of our Lord as 'standing at the celestial altar to offer sacrifice in heaven,' but, according to the Fathers, His glorified Humanity *itself* was the heavenly altar, and He could not possibly have stood at it, and the only sacrifices offered thereon were the sacrifices which His Church on earth offers in union with the one sacrifice of Himself.

[1] Theod., *In Ps.* cix. 4; Migne, *P. G.* lxxx. col. 1773.

[2] Euthym. Zig., *In Heb.* vii. 27; vii. 25. Speaking of the last passage Bishop Westcott writes: 'Euthymius here expresses the true conception of the Lord's Intercession with singular terseness and force.'

[3] Primas., *Ad Rom.* viii. 34; Migne, *P. L.* lxviii. col. 466; cf. *In Heb.* vii. 25, *ibid.* col. 731.

[4] S. Greg., *Moral* XXII. xvii. 42; Migne, *P. L.* lxxvi. col. 238.

Our Lord's *High Priestly* action in heaven, like that of the Jewish high priest on the Day of the Atonement, is to intercede. His *Priestly* action goes on in the Church through His priests in offering the Holy Eucharist, as Theodoret in the passage just quoted so clearly states. Both the Eucharistic sacrifice and the Intercession depend upon the sacrifice of the Cross, which is the only absolute sacrifice. Their chief difference is that in the Eucharist there is a sacrificial action—the separate consecration of the bread into our Lord's Body, and the wine into His Blood; while in our Lord's Intercession in heaven there is no sacrificial action whatever. He is the Sacrifice in heaven as He was on the Cross, *in a passive sense*, the Lamb slain to take away the sins of the world; but it is only in the sacrifice of the Eucharist on earth that the sacrificial action is now found, and the Eucharist is only a commemorative or relative sacrifice, depending absolutely upon the sacrifice of the Cross, of which it is not a repetition but a perpetuation.

While the Holy Eucharist and the Intercession in heaven alike rest upon the Cross as their foundation, they have a most real relation to one another, in that the Body present in the Eucharist is the glorified Body which reigns at the right hand of God in heaven.

V. In heaven our Lord not only exercises His office as Priest but as King. This is especially brought before us in the proper Psalm for Ascension Day, 'Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in.'[1] And in the Old Testament there are many prophecies of our Lord's Kingly office, while in the Gospels our Lord constantly speaks of His kingdom; and in the Nicene Creed we profess our faith that 'of

[1] Ps. xxiv. 7.

His Kingdom there shall be no end.' Our Lord reigns at the right hand of God, that is, exercises His royal prerogatives as Son of Man, as He says in the Revelation, 'To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in My throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with My Father in His throne.'[1] His Kingly functions are the expansion and final consummation of God's kingdom among men. He exercises them as Head of the Church, ruling through His Church, and through her bestowing His Royal gifts upon men. In Him we see humanity enthroned, raised to its highest position, and realising its most glorious hopes.

[1] Rev. iii. 21.

CHAPTER VII

ARTICLE VII

From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. —*Apostles' Creed.*

And He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end.—*Nicene Creed.*

From whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. At Whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.—*Athanasian Creed.*

Of the Judgment.

A BELIEF in the judgment is innate in man: it is one of the fundamental religious ideas found in human consciousness; for it follows necessarily from the conviction that man is a responsible being. There are many, doubtless, who would deny that they believed in a judgment to come, but few, or probably none, who, if they were asked, Are you a responsible being? would not answer, Certainly I am. Responsible, then, to whom? to what? To the laws of my country or to society, some would reply. And yet there are many who care little for law, and less for society, who yet feel that they are responsible beings, and in their inner conscience recognise a responsibility to Him, Whose representatives are law and society. If there be no judgment man is only responsible so far as that responsibility can be enforced, and that does not extend very far—only to actions which the law condemns or which are contrary to the changing code

of society's morals, not to what a man thinks, not to what a man is.

I. Natural religion, then, teaches a judgment to come, and Revelation tells us of the nature and character of that judgment. There are few facts on which our Lord dwells with greater fulness than that there will be a day of judgment and final retribution. Again and again in various parables the character of this judgment is revealed. Natural religion dwells almost exclusively on sins of commission, evil actions which men have done; the Christian revelation, on the other hand, chiefly on sins of omission, opportunities neglected or misused, duties left undone.

And this may be accounted for partly by the fact that conscience is chiefly *prohibitory*; it forbids rather than commands. It is necessary to add to natural conscience faith, in order that it may become *mandatory*, and may bring within the sphere of its operation the duties which flow from a recognition that we are God's stewards in this life, and that some day we must give an account of our stewardship.

A careful consideration of our Lord's teaching on this most solemn subject brings before us two prominent ideas in regard to the judgment: First, there is its searching character, extending even to thoughts and idle words, for in the list of deadly sins which our Lord gives, 'evil thoughts' is put at the very head of the list;[1] while on another occasion our Lord said 'that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment.'[2]

Then there is our responsibility for the use of gifts and opportunities. In the parable of the Unjust Steward[3] the accusation is that he had wasted his lord's goods; in that of the Rich man and Lazarus[4]

[1] S. Matt. xv. 19; S. Mark vii. 21.
[2] S. Matt xii. 36.
[3] S. Luke xvi. 1-13.
[4] S. Luke xvi. 19-31.

that the rich man had neglected the opportunity of ministering to the needs of Lazarus; in the parables of the Talents,[1] of the Pounds,[2] of the Ten Virgins,[3] of the Sheep and the Goats,[4] the teaching is similar;—in none is there any accusation of what we should call actual wrong-doing, that is, of sins of commission; always it is the leaving undone the duties of life, the neglect to use the gifts and talents intrusted to us.[5] And even in the parable of the Unmerciful Servant, which might seem to be an exception, the charge on which he is condemned is *not having compassion* on his fellow-servant.

And this indeed is reasonable when we reflect that God's purpose in creating us, and endowing us with so many gifts both of nature and grace, was not merely that we might do no harm in the world, but that we might do good. So the aspect of life on which our Lord dwells, not only in His parables, but in His revelation of the purpose of His own life on earth, is that life is given us to do God's will, to accomplish His work in the world.[6]

For this we were created, for this we are responsible, and in considering the Article of the Creed which treats of the Day of Judgment it is well for us to realise, what our Lord so emphasises in His teaching, that we shall be held accountable, not merely for our evil deeds, but for the fulfilment of God's purpose for us, for the use of the talents bestowed upon us, and of the opportunities put in our way.

We learn from revelation that the Judge shall be the Son of Man.[7] One who can 'be touched with the feeling of our infirmities,' seeing He 'was in all points tempted like as we are,'[8] and that He shall sit upon

[1] S. Matt. xxv. 14-31.
[2] S. Luke xix. 11-28.
[3] S. Matt. xxv. 1-14.
[4] S. Matt. xxv. 31-46.
[5] S. Matt. xviii. 23-35.
[6] S. John iv. 34.
[7] S. Matt. xxv. 31; cf. S. John v. 22.
[8] Heb. iv. 15.

the throne of His glory, and shall be attended by all the holy angels,[1] and the Saints,[2] and that the books of judgment shall be opened.[3]

Those who shall be judged are described in the Creed and in Holy Scripture as the quick and the dead,[4] and by the quick is doubtless meant those who shall be alive at our Lord's coming.[5]

The matter of the judgment includes thoughts, words, and deeds, and also neglected duties and opportunities.[6] And the results of the judgment are eternal, whether for good or evil, in heaven or in hell. So Holy Scripture in the very words of our Lord clearly states: 'These shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life everlasting.'[7] So, too, we profess in the Athanasian Creed: 'They that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.'

The general tendency in our own day is to pass over this solemn question, or, where it is treated at all, to minimise or deny the doctrine of eternal punishment, or else to substitute for it some human theory unknown either to Scripture or the Church. This tendency naturally belongs to an age characterised by lax views of morality and extreme impatience of all restrictions of authority. Under the influence of this spirit it is easy to overlook or fail to realise the tremendous and awful responsibility incurred by those who put into the background or explain away a doctrine, not only expressly revealed by our Lord Himself, but which occupies so prominent a position in His teachings[8] as does the doctrine of eternal punishment.

When we remember that our Blessed Lord knew

[1] S. Matt. xxv. 31. [2] S. Jude 14. [3] Rev. xx. 12.
[4] Acts x. 42; 2 Tim. iv. 1; 1 S. Pet. iv. 5. [5] 1 Thess. iv. 17.
[6] S. Matt. xxv. 45. [7] S. Matt. xxv. 46.
[8] Cf. S. Matt. xxv. 41 and 46; S. Matt. viii. 12 and x. 28; S. Mark ix. 43-48.

exactly in what sense His words would be understood by His Church, and when we further find in both East and West entire consent in teaching the doctrine of everlasting punishment, it does seem rashness amounting to presumption to weaken or change this teaching to suit the refined sensibilities of an age whose moral sense is not shocked at sin, but is greatly scandalised at the revelation that the consequences of sin may to the sinner be eternal.[1]

II. The realisation of the judgment, that is, a real belief in this Article of the Creed, is a great grace from God; for it leads to a sense of the awfulness of sin, and, therefore, to watchfulness against temptation and to a consciousness of responsibility for the gift of life with its duties and opportunities.

And this will imply the practice of frequent self-examination, for if we have to give account for our work—as the Athanasian Creed teaches, doubtless from our Lord's parable of the Unjust Steward, where we read, 'Give an account of thy stewardship; for thou mayest be no longer steward'[2]—if we have to give an account we must keep an account, and self-examination is the means by which we keep the account which we must one day render to God. We can render it now in penitence at the tribunal of mercy or hereafter at the Day of Judgment.

In making our self-examination we must begin with a recognition of the difficulties connected with it arising from our own self-love, and from the fact that the spirit of evil is always trying to deceive us about the sinfulness of sin. This makes it very difficult to judge ourselves honestly, but to help us we have the Holy Ghost, Whose office it is to convince the world of sin, and Who will, if we ask in prayer, give us light

[1] For further treatment of this subject cf. pp. 275, 276.
[2] S. Luke xvi. 2.

to know our sins; and more, when we begin to know them He will give us grace truly to repent of them so that they may be forgiven now in this life.

In this work of self-examination it is important that we should know something of the different classes into which sins fall.

There is first *material* and *formal* sin; for it is very evident that some actions which are materially or intrinsically sinful, when considered by themselves, are deprived of their guilt, that is, are not *formal* sin, because they were done in ignorance; for these there can be no responsibility, unless it be such as attaches to negligence in seeking instruction.

Then sins for purposes of self-examination may be divided into mortal and venial sins. S. John seems to teach this distinction when he writes, 'There is a sin unto death,' and again, 'There is a sin not unto death.'[1]

Mortal sin, as the word implies, is a sin of such gravity that it kills the spiritual life of the soul, depriving it of grace and cutting it off from communion with God. While recognising the terrible consequences of a mortal sin we must be careful not to exaggerate, and so to place in this category sins which, though serious, are lacking in some characteristic which would make them mortal; and we should remember that a Christian, who is using the means of grace and earnestly desirous to please God, ought never to fall into mortal sin.

The characteristics of mortal sin are three:—

(1) There must be 'weighty matter' (office for the Visitation of the Sick). Many Protestant sects fail to recognise any difference in degrees of a class of sin; for them stealing is stealing, and lying is lying: yet our moral sense surely refuses to admit that the act of a child who takes a lump of sugar involves the same guilt as that of a burglar who robs a bank; or that the habit

[1] 1 S. John v. 16, 17.

of exaggeration which leads a person to say what is not true, but from no other motive than perhaps vanity, is the same as the deliberate lie, which is not only intended to deceive but to injure another.

Not only, however, does our moral sense tell us this, but Holy Scripture; for S. John, in the passage from which we have quoted, tells us plainly that while 'all unrighteousness is sin' 'there is a sin not unto death' as well as 'a sin unto death'; so that, considered *per se*, the difference between mortal and venial sin is to be found in the gravity of the act itself.

(2) Moreover, for a sin to be mortal it must not only be *material* but *formal* sin, that is, it must not only have weighty matter, but there must be a consciousness of guilt. The person at the time that the sin was committed must have been conscious that he was doing wrong, for no sin committed in ignorance can be mortal.

(3) The third characteristic of mortal sin is consent of the will or deliberation, so that an act, however grievous, if done unintentionally, cannot be mortal. For instance, if through careless driving a man runs over a child and kills it, the guilt is to be found in the carelessness, and is not the *guilt* of murder.

All sin which is not mortal is 'venial.' But we must not think of venial sins as little sins, since in God's sight no sins are really little; but venial sins are such as do not destroy grace in the soul, and therefore do not separate the soul from God. We should realise that temptations to sin are not, as some suppose, to be classed with venial sin, since temptation is not sin at all; indeed temptation, if resisted, develops character, and enables us to acquire merit. Venial sins are rather those sins of infirmity or surprise into which every man at times is apt to fall, as we read in the book of Proverbs 'A just man falleth seven times.'[1]

[1] Prov. xxiv. 16.

An act of prayer or of contrition is sufficient for the remission of venial sin, as S. John seems to indicate in the words, 'If any man see his brother sin a sin which is *not unto death*, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin *not unto death*.'[1] For the remission of mortal sin, S. John implies that something more is needed; for he says: 'There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it.'[2] And the Prayer-Book in the office for the Visitation of the Sick, as also in the Exhortation in the Communion Service, teaches that for such sin confession and absolution is the remedy.

It would, however, be a great mistake to think lightly of venial sin, or to pass it over in our self-examination, since many evils and dangers follow in its train when it becomes habitual.

1. While theologians teach that venial sin does not diminish grace, since grace is the life of God in the soul, and life cannot be diminished, there being no state possible between life and death; yet as the vitality of a living man may be decreased and his power diminished by diseases which are not in themselves fatal, so in like manner venial sins do affect the grace of the soul, though indirectly, for these diminish its fervour, and fervour renders duty both easy and delightful. Thus a habit of venial sin often renders it difficult to fulfil our obligations,—as, for instance, to pray well,—and robs us of the sweetness of that communion with God, which might otherwise be experienced in prayer.

2. Again, venial sin often hinders graces which God would give us, and especially hinders our reception of sanctifying grace.

3. But the greatest evil of venial sin is that it disposes and prepares the soul for mortal sin. Just as slight sicknesses often reduce the strength of a man

[1] 1 S. John v. 16. [2] *Ibid.*

and render him more susceptible to great diseases, so lesser sins prepare the way for greater. Thus it is with *habits* of venial sin; by weakening the will they prepare for some great fall. 'White lies,' as they are sometimes called, prepare the way for downright falsehoods, little exhibitions of temper, for some great act of passion.

In making our self-examination we should therefore not overlook venial sins, and especially such as are habitual; a habit of sin, even though it be but venial sin, is a great hindrance to spiritual progress.

We have already pointed out the prominence our Blessed Lord gives to sins of omission; we must therefore carefully examine ourselves in regard to duties left undone, opportunities of doing good neglected.

It is often well in making our self-examination at special seasons to use some book of questions on the Ten Commandments or the Deadly Sins;[1] but such questions are scarcely necessary in ordinary self-examination.

We should be careful to avoid making our examination in a merely perfunctory manner,—it will only increase our condemnation to know what our sins are, if we do not go on to make acts of real contrition and repentance for our sins.

[1] One of the most helpful books of this sort is the late Canon Carter's *Manual of Repentance.*

CHAPTER VIII

ARTICLE VIII

I believe in the Holy Ghost.—*Apostles' Creed.*

And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, Who spake by the Prophets.—*Nicene Creed.*

The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.—*Athanasian Creed.*

Of the Holy Ghost.

The discussion of this Article demands a treatise, not a chapter; so that we must be content here with a brief investigation of the terms of the Article, and the addition of some notes on the work of the Holy Ghost.

I. We have already considered the position of the Holy Ghost in the inner life of the Ever-Blessed Trinity;[1] we shall therefore pass at once to the propositions affirmed of the Holy Ghost in this Article.

i. That He is a Divine Person. This is implied by the position of the Article; for the Holy Ghost stands in the same relative position in the Creed as the Father and the Son, but it is made certain by the titles 'Lord' and 'Life-Giver.'[2] Lord, as we have already seen,[3] is the equivalent of the Hebrew Jehovah, and can only be applied by the Christian (or Jew) to God; and Life-Giving is also an attribute of God. In Holy Scripture we find other attributes of God ascribed to

[1] Cf. pp. 118-127. [2] τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν. [3] Cf. p. 139.

the Holy Ghost, as for instance Omniscience,[1] Omnipotence,[2] Omnipresence.[3] We find Him associated in terms of equality with the Father and the Son in such passages as the Baptismal formula, 'baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,'[4] and the Apostolic benediction, 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost.'[5]

We find S. Peter in his condemnation of Ananias speaking of the Holy Ghost as God; for he says, 'Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost . . . thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.'[6]

These and many other passages show that neither Holy Scripture nor the Creeds leave any room for the opinion advanced by some that the Holy Ghost is not a Person of the Godhead, but a power or influence of God metaphorically personified, as 'death,' and 'sin,' and other powers are in Holy Scripture.

The title 'Life-Giver' (*ζωοποιόν*) teaches us that in the work both of Creation and Restoration the Holy Spirit is the vivifying principle and creative power—that He is, in a word, the Agent of all Creation. S. Basil describes His work in the new creation in these words: 'By the Holy Spirit is given the restoration to Paradise, the rising to the kingdom of heaven, the restoration of the adoption of sons, the confidence of calling God our Father, the communion of the grace of Christ, the appellation of a child of light, the participation of eternal glory;—in a word, the plenitude of benediction, both in the present time and in the future of those good things laid up for us.'[7]

ii. The Nicene Creed tells us that He proceeds from

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 10; S. John xvi. 13.
[2] Rom. viii. 11.
[3] Wisd. i. 7.
[4] S. Matt. xxviii. 19.
[5] 2 Cor. xiii. 14.
[6] Acts v. 3.
[7] S. Basil, *De Spir. Sanct.* xv. 36; Migne, *P. G.* xxxii. col. 132.

the Father and the Son, and the Athanasian Creed implies this. We have given the history of the introduction of the clause 'Filioque' into the Creed,[1] and have treated of the double Procession;[2] it remains for us to point out that the difference between Eastern and Western theologians is one of words rather than of doctrine, and that the teaching of the early Fathers seems to imply the double Procession.

Easterns admit that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father by the Son,[3] or, as they sometimes put it, that He 'proceedeth from the Father and receiveth from the Son';[4] while Westerns, in teaching the double Procession, are careful to assert that there is in the Godhead only one Principle or Source (Ἀρχη or Πηγή). Hence the difference is chiefly in mode of definition.

Further, we find passages in the Fathers in which the double Procession is either taught or implied: *e.g.* 'The Spirit is not foreign to the Son, for He is called the Spirit of Truth, and Christ is the Truth; and He proceeds from Him as from God the Father.'[5] 'It is not necessary that one should speak of Him, for He must be confessed as having origin from the Father and the Son.'[6] 'The Holy Spirit also, when He proceeds from the Father and the Son, is not separated from the Father, is not separated from the Son.'[7] From these passages it is evident that the doctrine was not unknown, and in reply to the charge of an unlawful introduction of the clause into the Creed, we may

[1] Cf. pp. 76-82. [2] Cf. p. 121.

[3] *τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι' Τἱοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον.* Cf. Creed of Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople; Migne, *P. G.* xcviii. col. 1461.

[4] *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Τἱοῦ λαμβανόμενον.* Cf. Creed of Epiphanius; Migne, *P. G.* xliii. col. 233.

[5] S. Cyril. Alex., *Ep.* xvii.; *Ad. Nest. de Excom.* 10. Migne, *P. G.* lxxvii. col. 117.

[6] S. Hilary, *De Trinitate*, lib. ii. 29; Migne, *P. L.* x. col. 69.

[7] S. Ambrose, *De Spir. Sanct.* lib. i. c. xi. 120; Migne, *P. L.* xiv. col. 733.

point out, as Dr. Pusey has done,[1] that the additions supposed to have been made by the Council of Constantinople (which was wholly a Greek Council) to the Nicene Creed were equally unwarranted; and in the light of recent historical discoveries in regard to the source of the Constantinopolitan Creed this argument becomes even stronger. Moreover, the 'Filioque' is not the only addition which has been made.

iii. The Nicene Creed then adds, what is a necessary inference, that as the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, so with the Father and the Son together He is worshipped and glorified.

iv. This Article concludes with the clause, 'Who spake by the Prophets.' It is probable that this was simply intended as corroborative proof that the Holy Ghost was God; for this part of the Creed, as we learn from the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, was intended to meet the heresy of the Pneumatomachi. No one doubted that the prophets were sent by God and inspired by Him; hence to assert that they spake by the Holy Ghost was to assert that the Holy Ghost was God. The Article has, however, a further value in our own day, when assaults upon the authenticity and inspiration of Holy Scripture are so common, in that it proclaims the inspiration of the writers of Holy Scripture, though without indicating the method of that inspiration.

II. If we turn now to the work of the Holy Ghost, we shall observe that it falls into three divisions:

i. The work of the Holy Spirit before the Incarnation; ii. His work in the Incarnation; and iii., His work since Pentecost.

i. In the opening words of revelation the Holy Ghost is brought before us as the Agent in Creation.

[1] In a letter to the *Times*, Dec. 28, 1875.

We are told that 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.'[1]

To the third Person of the Holy Trinity has been assigned the office of Perfecting the works of God; not as though God's works were created incomplete or imperfect, but it is the function of the Holy Ghost to lead all things to their end, to enable them to accomplish God's purpose, which is their perfection. So we find the Spirit of God represented in the first chapter of Genesis as the Agent by whose operation the material world is developed from a condition described as 'without form and void,' to that in regard to which we are told that 'God saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good.'[2] And in the New Testament we learn that it is by the operation of the same Spirit of God that the soul of man, and the mystical Body of Christ, the Church, are sanctified and perfected.

In regard to the first creation, the Biblical account has been thought by some to imply that the Hexameron described in Genesis i. was rather a work of restoration than of creation, the words translated 'without form and void' (literally 'wasteness and desolation') pointing to some previous catastrophe by which the first creation had been wrecked. This some have thought was occasioned by the fall of the Angels. Without, however, pronouncing any opinion on the point, we may observe that the idea of a process of evolution is by no means a product of our own age, for not only is it found in S. Augustine[3] and others,

[1] Gen. i. 1, 2. [2] Gen. i. 31.

[3] Prius ergo materia facta est, confusa et informis, unde omnia fierent, quæ distincta atque formata sunt—S. Aug. *de Genesi contra Manich.*, lib. 1. c. v. 9; Migne, *P. L.* xxxiv. col. 178.

but Peter Lombard, the Master of the Sentences, suggests that all things were made *materially* at first, but became *formally* distinct afterwards through passage of time, as herbs, trees, and perhaps animals.[1] And it is certain that the language of Genesis lends itself better to a process of evolution, or development, than to a series of special creations. We read that 'God *created* the heaven and the earth' (v. 1), that He '*created* . . . every living creature that moveth' (v. 21), and that 'God *created* man in His own image' (v. 27). This would seem to correspond with the creation of *matter*, of *life*, and of *mind*. But 'God said, Let the earth *bring forth* grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit' (v. 11); and 'Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven' (v. 20); and again 'Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind' (v. 24). These do not suggest creation, but evolution or development.

Hence we may perhaps consider the work of the Holy Spirit in creation to be the development, by means of environment and natural selection, of the endless varieties of species which add so much to the beauty of the world, and manifest so plainly the wisdom and power of God. This, too, would be a counterpart of the work of the Holy Ghost in the soul of man, developing its latent powers not only by grace given within, but by the environment which calls for the exercise of those powers and the use of that grace. Thus we see the work of the Holy Spirit in perfecting both the material and spiritual works of God.

[1] Quædam vero non formaliter, sed materialiter tunc facta fuisse, quæ post per temporis accessum formaliter distincta sunt, ut bestiæ, arbores, et forte animalia.—Pet. Lombard. *Sent.*, lib. II. d. xv. 5; Migne, *P. L.* cxcii. col. 682.

After the Fall, the work of the Holy Spirit upon man in preparing him for that restoration which was to be the result of the Incarnation, is traced in a threefold operation. 1. From within He acts upon man's conscience, convincing him of sin.[1] 2. From without He reveals to man the law of God, so giving him a standard of conduct and a rule of worship. 3. And further, through the Prophets He reveals God's will, making known God's gracious promises and declaring His judgments. Let us briefly consider these three methods by which the Holy Ghost prepared man for the Incarnation.

1. By acting upon the conscience of man. From the time of Adam in Paradise to the end of the world, two spirits have claimed man's allegiance, have offered to lead man in the difficult paths of life,—the spirit of evil and the Spirit of God; for, as S. Paul tells us, 'As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God.'[2] The fall of man in Adam was occasioned by yielding to the leading of the spirit of evil, and from that time on to the end of the world we find, and shall find, a division among men, some yielding to the spirit of evil and choosing what S. Paul calls (in the same chapter) to 'live after the flesh,'[3] others following the guidance of the Spirit of God, and living in the freedom of the sons of God. We read of these 'sons of God' in the earliest records of Genesis.

This division is seen first in Cain and Abel; then we are especially told of Enoch that he 'walked with God,'[4] but in the time of Noah we read that 'the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive

[1] Cf. Hutchings, *The Person and Work of the Holy Ghost*, 3rd ed. chap. ii.
[2] Rom. viii. 14. [3] *Ibid.* viii. 13. [4] Gen. vi. 2, 3.

with men, for that he also is flesh.' The passage is a mysterious one and has been diversely interpreted, but this much seems clear, that it marks a deterioration so great in the 'sons of God,' *i.e.* those who had been led by the Spirit of God, that the Spirit is withdrawn from them apparently because they had chosen the life of mere fleshly pleasure.

The flood follows, and the work of the Spirit begins anew in the family of Noah, of whom Ham and Canaan choose the evil life. In Abraham a great advance is made; a special family is chosen, with whom God enters into a covenant, and from whom a nation is developed; and henceforth the work of the Spirit in preparing man for the Incarnation proceeds steadily, yet not without great vicissitudes.

2. In the Mosaic dispensation we observe a new operation of the Spirit in the giving of the Law by which God's chosen people were taught on the one hand how to worship God, on the other how to serve God acceptably in a holy life. The Law as given through Moses consisted of three divisions: (*a*) The Ceremonial law, which taught all that related to the worship of God and prepared for our Lord's coming by its symbolical sacrifices; (*b*) the Moral law, as summed up in the Ten Commandments, which gave man a moral code based upon the revealed Will of God; (*c*) and thirdly, the judgments. 'Thou shalt keep the commandments and the statutes, and the *judgments*.'[1] This Judicial law was the direct work of the Holy Spirit, as we see from God's direction to Moses to choose seventy men of the elders of Israel upon whom God might bestow 'the Spirit' which was upon Moses.[2]

Some have seen in S. Paul's description of the Law as 'holy, just, and good'[3] a recognition of this three-fold division, the Ceremonial law being referred to

[1] Deut. vii. 11. [2] Numb. xi. 16, 17. [3] Rom. vii. 12.

as 'holy,' the Judicial law as 'just,' and the Moral law as 'good.'[1]

3. A further advance in the work of the Holy Spirit in preparing man for the Incarnation is singled out, as we have seen, for special notice in the Nicene Creed, in the clause, 'Who spake by the Prophets.' Here we have certain special revelations on special occasions to individuals, who become, as it were, the mouthpiece of the Holy Ghost to deliver to God's people certain messages of warning or encouragement, teaching them God's will, declaring God's judgments, and proclaiming God's gracious promises not only in regard to the present and immediate future, but unfolding God's loving purposes for His people in the Incarnation.

The work of the Holy Ghost, then, from the Fall to the Incarnation, consisted first in brooding over the race, fallen but not forsaken, and in leading those who corresponded to His inspirations; then in choosing from the race a family and a people, and training them, and from them producing one, the Blessed Virgin Mary, who by sanctity should be a fitting instrument of the Incarnation. We may therefore regard Mary, full of grace, as the crowning operation of the Holy Ghost upon humanity *in preparation* for the Incarnation.

ii. The second great stage in the work of the Holy Ghost is His work as the Agent of the Incarnation. This is brought before us in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, in the clauses, 'Conceived by the Holy Ghost,' and 'Was incarnate by the Holy Ghost.'

As the Incarnation has already been treated,[2] it will be sufficient here to draw attention to one or two points in which the operation of the Holy Ghost in this great Mystery is manifested.

1. S. Luke tells us that the Angel Gabriel in answer

[1] Hutchings, *The Person and Work of the Holy Ghost*, p. 63.
[2] Chapter iii.

to her question revealed to the Blessed Virgin the manner in which the Incarnation was to be accomplished in these words: 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee.'[1] This overshadowing of God's chosen instrument reminds us of that overshadowing or brooding (as the Hebrew word signifies) over the wasteness and desolation described in the second verse of Genesis: the Spirit of God brooding over the expanse of waters, when 'God said, Let there be light: and there was light,'—light to see the wasteness and desolation, and then gradual restoration. So again, brooding over the great mass of humanity, sinful but not abandoned, the Holy Ghost has trained one individual perfectly to surrender herself to God's Will, and overshadowing her, God said, 'Let there be light,' and there was indeed light; for His only begotten Son stepped down into creation to become the Light of the World, not only revealing the darkness and confusion of sin, but beginning the work of redemption.

So is it in the first great extension of the Incarnation, the Sacrament of Baptism: the Holy Ghost overshadows the child born in sin, and by the grace of Baptism light is kindled in the regenerate soul, the light of Him who was the Light of the world.

2. The Holy Ghost in the life of the Holy Trinity is the bond of union between the Father and the Son. His work is to *unite* with God; so He becomes the Agent by whom the hypostatic union between the created and uncreated natures of Christ is effected, the human and divine natures being united hypostatically in the One Person of the Son of God through the operation of the Holy Ghost.

So too is He the Agent by which the individual soul is mystically united to God in spiritual life.

3. We have already referred to the unction of the

[1] S. Luke i. 35.

Holy Ghost by which our Lord's human nature was anointed for His threefold office of Prophet, Priest, and King,[1] from which His Name 'Christ' is derived, and by which the prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled: 'the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord.'[2]

In the spotless humanity of Christ the Holy Ghost finds a resting-place: 'the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him'; for to Him, as S. John proclaims in his Gospel, 'God giveth not the Spirit by measure';[3] and the Baptist witnesses of Him, 'I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon Him.'[4]

iii. There remains for us briefly to notice the work of the Holy Ghost in His temporal mission in the Church of Christ.

Among the Old Testament administrations of the work of the Holy Ghost, few are more striking than the three missions of the dove sent forth by Noah from the Ark after the flood.[5] From the first the dove returned, having 'found no rest for the sole of her foot'; from the second she returned, and 'lo, in her mouth was an olive leaf pluckt off'; the third time the dove was sent forth 'she returned not again.'

The first mission may be taken for the work of the Holy Spirit before the Incarnation; the second, by its olive leaf, surely typifies the work of the Incarnation; the third, the mission at Pentecost, which still lasts on. In the first, the dove finds no rest for the sole of her foot; so before the Incarnation there was no dwelling-place for the Holy Ghost in man. By the Incarnation peace is proclaimed, and in the human nature of our Lord the dove finds a resting-place; while after

[1] Cf. pp. 133-136.
[2] Isa. xi. 2.
[3] S. John iii. 34.
[4] S. John ii. 32.
[5] Gen. viii. 8-12.

Pentecost, through the channel of the sacred humanity, the Holy Spirit finds a dwelling-place in the soul of man as well as in the Church of Christ.[1]

1. Pentecost, the birthday of the Church, is the fulfilment of the Vision of Ezekiel of the dry bones. 'Thus saith the Lord God; Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live. So I prophesied as He commanded me, and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood up upon their feet, an exceeding great army.'[2]

The dry bones of humanity at Pentecost are gathered into the Church and become an exceeding great army, conquering the world; and the Agent is the Lord, the Life-Giver, the Holy Ghost. The Spirit of God had never abandoned man, but His work had been transient, He could find no dwelling-place; now in the Church of Christ and in the soul of man He is to dwell *personally*. This is the great difference between the work of the Holy Spirit before and after the Incarnation—a personal indwelling instead of transient operations.

The next Article of the Creed—the Catholic Church—tells of the manifestation of this indwelling of the Holy Ghost; for He is the Life of the Church, the Source of its unity, the Power of its growth, the Agent of its Sacraments, and above all, its Guide into all truth. The deposit of truth given at Pentecost[3] is His gift, and is unfolded by Him as the Church has need.

As the work of the Holy Ghost in the Church belongs to the next Article, we shall in this place only draw attention to a common error, which ascribes to the Holy Ghost a separate dispensation.

People often write and speak as though there were

[1] Rupertus applies this type somewhat differently.—Rupert., *De Trinit. et oper.* tom. I. lib. iv. 23; Migne, *P. L.* clxvii. col. 347, 348.
[2] Ezek. xxxvii. 9, 10.
[3] Cf. p. 109.

three dispensations: that of the Father in the Old Testament, that of the Son during our Lord's historic life on earth, and that of the Holy Spirit now, and indeed from the day of Pentecost. This is quite erroneous. We are Christians, members of the Church of Christ, living under the Christian dispensation, and the Holy Spirit working in the Church and in our souls is the Spirit of Christ, sent by Him, and the direct result of His continuous intercession in heaven.

By His agency in the Sacraments Christ is brought to us. In Baptism we are incorporated into His mystical Body; in the Holy Eucharist we feed upon His Body; in Penance we are cleansed by His Precious Blood. The Holy Ghost carries on the work of Christ, but in no sense supersedes it.

2. Not only does the Holy Ghost dwell in the Church, but in each soul that has been incorporated into Christ by Baptism. It is at Baptism that the Holy Ghost takes up His personal abode in the soul, bestowing upon it potentially those sevenfold gifts which were the special prerogative of Christ as anointed by the Holy Ghost,[1] and which are given in all their fulness in Confirmation. There is a modern theory, which has been quite lately put forth, that the indwelling of the Holy Ghost does not follow Baptism, but Confirmation; that whereas certain gifts are bestowed in Baptism, the Holy Ghost is not given till Confirmation. This theory is unknown to the theologians either of the Eastern or Western Churches, and its consequence is to deny the Personal gift of the Holy Ghost to all that large class of Christians who, though members of Christ by Baptism, are severed from the Church's unity. Presbyterians, Methodists, and other Sectarians, according to this theology, are Christians without the Spirit of Christ. This *reductio ad absurdum* should be sufficient to condemn such a

[1] Acts x. 38; iv. 27; Isa. xi. 2.

theory. Our Lord has told us, 'By their fruits ye shall know them,'[1] and it should certainly be our joy, while mourning over their separation from ourselves, to recognise in many Sectarians, often in great abundance, the fruits of the Spirit, the evidence that through Baptism they have received the gift of the Spirit of God.

The gifts of the Holy Ghost, as we have already observed, are, in the first place, the endowment of the sacred Humanity of our Blessed Lord as the second Adam, the perfect or archetypal Man, the Head of our race. In Him we see their *perfect* manifestation; but they are not confined to Him, for the anointing of our Great High Priest is shared in by every member of His Body, and these gifts are 'like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down unto the beard, even unto Aaron's beard, and went down to the skirts of his clothing.'[2] They are, therefore, found in His Church where we can study their *corporate* operation, and also in each of His members, in whom is seen their *individual* manifestation.

In the *germ* these gifts are possessed by all the baptized, and may be developed by those who are unconfirmed, but with much greater difficulty, and possibly never in their fulness.

Of these gifts of the Holy Ghost four are intended to perfect the intellect, and three to strengthen and perfect the will. The four intellectual gifts are Wisdom, Understanding, Counsel, and Knowledge. By their aid we can, under the different circumstances of life, *know* what is right and true. The three moral gifts, which perfect the will, are Ghostly Strength, Piety (or True-godliness), and Holy Fear. These three gifts enable us when we know what is right to *do* it. The general effect of these gifts of the Holy Ghost is to form in us the features of the Perfect Man, our Lord

[1] S. Matt. vii. 20. [2] Ps. cxxxiii. 2.

Jesus Christ, and their exercise should be manifested in the production of a Christlike life as revealed by our Lord Himself in the Seven Beatitudes.

Besides this, S. Paul tells us that there are nine *Fruits* of the Spirit which we may consider as the result of the possession and use of the Seven Gifts. These fruits of the Spirit fall into three classes: those which we exercise towards *God*—Love, Joy, and Peace; those which we manifest towards our *neighbour*—Long-suffering, Kindness, and Goodness; and those which form in *ourselves*—the special virtues of Fidelity, Meekness, and Temperance.

CHAPTER IX

ARTICLE IX

The Holy Catholic Church; the Communion of Saints.—*Apostles' Creed.*

And I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church.—*Nicene Creed.*

I. Of the Church.

The English word Church, like the Scottish Kirk, and the German Kirche, is derived from the Greek κυριακή, an adjective signifying that which belongs to the Lord. It is the equivalent of the Greek and Latin ἐκκλησία (from ἐκκαλέω), but long before ἐκκλησία had passed into the New Testament it had taken on a special meaning, being used at Athens for the assembly of the free citizens of the Commonwealth, and in a similar sense it is employed in the Septuagint as the equivalent of the Hebrew Qāhāl, the word used in the Old Testament to describe the whole nation of Israel regarded as an organised society. In the New Testament the word Church is found twice in the Gospels,[1] but many times in the Acts, Epistles, and Revelation. The idea, then, which is expressed by the 'Church,' is that of Christians regarded as a society, and not as a mere collection of individuals. The Church is an organised society, a social unity, consisting of all that is *salvable* in the human race, of the world itself as the object of redemption.[2]

[1] S. Matt. xvi. 18; S. Matt. xviii. 17.

[2] For an interesting investigation of the use of the term 'Ecclesia,' cf. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, Chap. i.

While it is true that our Lord died for each one, and loved each one of us with a real and individual love, so that S. Paul could say, 'Who loved *me* and gave Himself for *me*,'[1] yet we must not lose sight of the other side of this truth, that 'God so loved the *world*, that He gave His only begotten Son.' The term 'world' is an equivocal word, and is used in Holy Scripture in many different senses; *e.g.* of this present age,[2] as representing the majority of men,[3] as symbolising riches or power,[4] as personifying the powers of evil,[5] and as representing man as a social organisation, the race Christ came to save. The number of passages in which the word is used in this last sense is very large, and in them our Lord is spoken of as the Saviour of the world,[6] as redeeming or reconciling[7] the world, as loving[8] the world, etc.

These passages point to the fact that in Holy Scripture man is recognised as by nature a social being, and is not in the work of redemption to be regarded *merely* as an individual, but as a social unit; that there is a solidarity in the race which is recognised alike in the Fall and in Redemption, and which is a most important element in our conception of the Church or Christian 'Ecclesia.'

Among the titles used in the New Testament to describe the Church, the two most suggestive are 'the Kingdom of heaven,' and 'the Body of Christ.' Both alike imply a society, and into both alike, as we are clearly told, the admission is by Baptism; for we read: 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God';[9] and again,

[1] Gal. ii. 20.
[2] S. John iii. 16.
[3] S. Luke i. 70; S. Matt. xiii. 40.
[4] S. Matt. iv. 8; xvi. 26.
[5] S. John xiv. 30; xvii. 14.
[6] S. John iii. 17; iv. 42; vi. 33, 51; xii. 47; 1 Tim. ii. 4; 1 S. John iv. 14.
[7] Rom. xi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 19; cf. 1 S. John ii. 2; iv. 10.
[8] S. John iii. 16.
[9] S. John iii. 5.

'For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For in one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.'[1] The Church therefore, regarded *extensively*, consists of all the baptized.

i. In the Creeds we have given us four notes or characteristics of the Church, that She is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic; and by examining these notes we shall better understand what the Church claims to be and really is.

1. We begin with the Unity of the Church.

There are two conceptions of the Unity of the Church: the one the idea of a body or society accidentally formed of individual members who have gradually come together, and for mutual edification or interest have enrolled themselves into a body or corporation. If this conception of the Church be true, the 'body' is a purely human creation, and the individual members have only an accidental and not an organic unity, for at any time, by the action of its members, the body might be dissolved. In this case the body would grow from below,—from the fact into the idea.

The other conception of the Church is the entire reverse of this. Here the body is a divine idea, realised in fact, as by Baptism members are added to the body; but here we have an organic, not an accidental unity, a unity which cannot be destroyed or dissolved, since as the body is not an aggregation of members, but exists first, the members being members of the one body, if that one body die, the members die with it.

Which of these is the true conception of the Church's unity? Is it a unity reached from below or from above? is it an accidental or organic unity? Our Lord's great high-priestly prayer gives us the answer. He prays 'That they all may be one; as Thou, Father,

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13.

art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us'; and again, 'That they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one.'[1] From this we may certainly learn that the unity which the Church represents, and for which our Lord prays, is a personal unity—the unity of God; it is not the final stage of an evolution, but the Church is one essentially, because God is One.

We may perhaps gain a clearer proof of the true view of the Church's unity by examining the three partial or erroneous views which are found amongst us now.

(1) There is first the modern rationalistic view, to which we have referred, of a unity artificially formed from diversity by fusing individuals into a society. This, as we have seen, is absolutely inconsistent with our Lord's revelation in Holy Scripture of the Church's unity.

(2) The next is the Puritan view of a purely *spiritual* unity, which is independent of, and indeed contrasted with, a bodily or corporate unity.

(3) The third is the modern Roman view of a bodily unity, visible and external, and contrasted with spiritual unity. The last two views, while diametrically opposed, contain partial and different views of truth; they are mutually complementary, though apparently opposed, and together make up the whole truth, for the unity of the Church is both a bodily and a spiritual union. 'For in one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.'[2]

But here we must carefully determine what we mean by 'body.' Do we mean something separate from and contrasted with spirit? Certainly not; for though spirit can be separated from body, it is only at the expense of the body's life that this can be done; and a living human body implies union with and possession

[1] S. John xvii. 21-23. [2] 1 Cor. xii. 13.

of spirit. Body, therefore, is altogether dependent upon, and is indeed a manifestation of, spirit.

So S. Paul writes, 'Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one spirit,'[1] and certainly no one ever in his own life better or at greater cost exemplified this principle, as the history of S. Paul's tremendous and lifelong struggle to preserve unity between the Judaizing and Gentile parties in the early Christian Church shows. If a mere internal and spiritual unity, which does not manifest itself in visible intercommunion, were sufficient, S. Paul's absolute refusal to acquiesce in the formation of two distinct bodies was inexplicable, and his efforts and sacrifices to preserve, at almost any cost, external and visible unity between the Church he founded among the Gentiles and that presided over by S. James at Jerusalem were quite useless and vain.

In most great principles we may distinguish between that which is essential and that which is ideal; in the four characteristics of the Church which we are treating we shall find this exemplified, for in each we shall discover an essential and an ideal standard. In regard to the first, the unity of the Church: we find the essential unity in the common participation of the one spiritual life, in the fellowship of that Holy Spirit which circulates like the life-blood through every living member of Christ's Body, the Church; its visible symbol being the one Baptism by which all are incorporated into the one body.

The ideal unity is the fellowship of all the members manifested in their intercommunion in the Sacraments, and especially in the Holy Eucharist; and in their perfect love for one another. We must not think of this ideal unity either as unattainable or unattained. In the first ages of the Church it was realised, so far as intercommunion, though sometimes with difficulty, and

[1] Eph. iv. 3, 4.

it is realised perfectly now in the Church triumphant; for we must not narrowly confine the Church to the members who are militant now on earth. The Church exists in three states—the Church militant here on earth, the Church expectant in the intermediate state, and the Church triumphant in heaven; and we may hope that by far the majority now enjoy the privileges of the Church in heaven.

For greater unity now and here we ought to work and pray. And we may strive to attain to it, not by mutilating the body or surrendering its most precious gifts, but by charity and forbearance, by trying to see what is good even in the most imperfect forms of Christianity.

We should show our desire for this unity, not by proclaiming that those who differ from us and are separated from intercommunion with us by schism are therefore no part of the Body of Christ, which is not true, but by recognising that they are members of the same body as ourselves, and by striving to bring them to a better appreciation of their gifts and privileges. We should regard them rather as fellow-children with us of the Great King, who are ignorant of their privileges and responsibilities, and who are living a life unworthy of their high lineage and possibilities. We are not to give up our own privileges to unite with them in their lower life; but recognising that they are the King's children, we should strive to lead them to realise and value their heritage.

2. The second note of the Church is Holiness.

The Church is holy because it is the Body of Christ, and is dwelt in by the Holy Ghost.

It is holy because its end is to make its members holy by imparting to them the righteousness of Christ, and by making them through Baptism the temples of the Holy Ghost.

The means by which it accomplishes this end are

its Sacraments, which are holy as the channels of grace; its doctrines, which are holy as being the truth once for all delivered to the Church at Pentecost, and continually unfolded according to the Church's needs by the Holy Ghost; and its precepts, which are holy as enjoined for the purpose of forming in its members holiness of life.

Again, the Church is holy in that it requires holiness in its members, and is thus distinguished from Lutheranism which teaches not, like the Church, an imparted righteousness, which makes the individual holy, but an imputed righteousness, which leaves him unholy. Lutheranism, however, by a sort of legal fiction, counts man holy by imputing to him the righteousness of Christ, and, as it were, casts this righteousness around him as a cloak, thus covering and concealing, but not cleansing or removing, his sin.[1]

As in each of the notes of the Church, we may here distinguish between the Church's essential and ideal holiness.

The Church's essential holiness is seen in its separation from the evil world, and its ceaseless warfare against sin. Its ideal holiness, the entire freedom from sin, is realised now only in the Church triumphant, in which is found that 'holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.'[2] The work of the Church both on earth and in the intermediate state is to prepare souls to enter heaven by helping them to become holy.

Thus at last shall be realised our Lord's purpose for the Church, as revealed by S. Paul, that 'Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.'[3]

[1] Cf. the Lutheran doctrine of Justification, p. 185.
[2] Heb. xii. 14.
[3] Eph. v. 25-27.

The attempt to realise ideal holiness in this world of sin has led again and again to both schism and hypocrisy, as instanced by the Donatists, Novatians, Cathari, and Puritans. The Parables of the Tares and of the Draw-Net are a warning against this.[1]

3. Catholicity is the third note of the Church.

The word 'Catholic,' as applied to the Church, was used, at least from the beginning of the second century, in two senses: that of universality, and that of orthodoxy. The Church is *universal* or Catholic as distinguished from Jewish and Sectarian exclusiveness, and as recognising that all men are eligible for and equal in its society. S. Cyril of Jerusalem describes this aspect of the Catholic character of the Church by showing that it embraces the whole world (or rather that it is the Church for the whole world), that it comprehends in its doctrines the whole truth, that it claims as its subjects all classes of men, that it has its remedies for all kinds of sin, and that it includes and inculcates every form of virtue.[2] The earliest use of the term Catholic, as describing the Church, is found in the writings of S. Ignatius (*ob. c.* 110) as distinguishing the Church from sects;[3] and next in the circular Epistle of the Church of Smyrna in regard to the martyrdom of its bishop S. Polycarp (*ob. c.* 155) as distinguishing the true Church throughout the world.

In section viii. we find, 'But when He had ended the prayer, having made mention of all who had at any time been associated with Him, of little and great, of those who were distinguished and those who were obscure, and of all the Catholic Church throughout the world.'[4] And again in section xvi. they speak of S. Polycarp as Bishop of the Catholic Church in Smyrna.[5]

[1] S. Matt. xiii. 24-31; 47-51.
[2] Cf. S. Cyril Hier., *Cat.* xviii. 23; Migne, *P. G.* xxxiii. col. 1044.
[3] S. Ignat., *Ep. ad Smyrn.* viii.; Migne, *P. G.* v. col. 852.
[4] *Ep. Eccles. Smyrn. de Martyrio S. Polycarpi*; Migne, v. col. 1036.
[5] *Ibid.* col. 1041.

The note of Catholicity distinguishes the Church from Calvinism, as Holiness does from Lutheranism; for Calvinism confines the Church to a limited number of members who are predestined and elected to salvation, and so shuts out the great majority of baptized Christians.

The essential Catholicity of the Church is seen in her proclamation that all men are eligible for her membership, and equal in her sight as regards their salvability.

Her ideal Catholicity is the extension of these privileges to all mankind in accordance with her Master's command, 'Go ye therefore and teach all nations,'[1] or according to S. Mark, 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature.'[2]

Her Catholicity is marred by a theory like that of the Donatists or Puritans on the one hand, or that of the Church of Rome on the other, which narrows the Church either to external communion with the Bishop of Rome, or to the ideal holiness of a self-constituted standard.

S. Vincent of Lerins in his *Commonitorium* supplies a well-known test of Catholicity in doctrine, by his well-known canon: 'Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus';[3] 'Universality, Antiquity, and Consent.'

4. The last note of the Church is its Apostolicity.

By this we mean that the Church's authority depends upon her 'Mission,' that is, upon the fact that she has been sent by her Lord to evangelise the world, and that in that 'Mission' is included the authority and gifts necessary for her work.

We read that on the first Easter Day our Lord said to His Apostles, 'As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you';[4] and again before His Ascension, 'Go, make disciples of all nations, baptizing them.'[5]

[1] S. Matt. xxviii. 19.
[2] S. Mark xvi. 15.
[3] S. Vincent Liren., *Commonitorium*; Migne, *P. L.* l. col. 640.
[4] S. John xx. 21.
[5] S. Matt. xxviii. 19.

S. Paul tells the Ephesians that they 'are built upon the foundation of the *Apostles and Prophets*, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone'; [1] while S. John, in describing the Church under the figure of the New Jerusalem, says that 'the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve *Apostles* of the Lamb.' [2]

In the Epistle to the Romans we read, 'How shall they preach except they be *sent*?' [3] and in the Pastoral Epistles we find allusions to the method of handing on the mission which S. Paul had received.[4]

This mission implies not only the handing on of Apostolic doctrine, but of *Apostolic succession*, by which we mean a principle of continuity in the ministry of the Church, the bishops succeeding one another in an unbroken chain from Christ Himself through His Apostles and their successors the bishops of the Church, and reaching down to the Episcopate of the present day.

For while the Episcopate, as we now have it, did not exist during the period of the Apostolate, something very like it began to show itself towards the close of the Apostolic Age in S. James of Jerusalem, S. Timothy, and S. Titus, and a little later, perhaps, in S. Clement of Rome.[5] And we have clear evidence that by the time of S. Ignatius, *i.e.* in the first decade of the next century, and within a few years of the death of S. John, the Episcopate was fully established at least in Asia; for we read in the Epistle of S. Ignatius to the Philadelphians, 'For as many as are of God and Jesus Christ, these are with the Bishop; and as many as shall come penitent into the unity of the Church, they also shall be of God, that they may live after

[1] Eph. ii. 20. [2] Rev. xxi. 14. [3] Rom. x. 15.
[4] 1 Tim. iii.; iv. 14; v. 22; 2 Tim. i. 6; Tit. i. 6.
[5] The Church in Rome seems to have been governed by a College of Presbyters till well into the second century. Cf. Wordsworth, *The Ministry of Grace*, pp. 125-131.

Jesus Christ. Be not deceived, my brethren. If any one followeth him that maketh a schism, he doth not inherit the kingdom of God. If any one walk in strange doctrine he hath no fellowship (*οὐκ συγκατατίθεται*) with the passion. Be careful therefore to keep to one Eucharist; for there is one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup of His Blood, unto unity; there is one Altar, as there is one bishop, together with the presbytery and deacons, my fellow-servants.'[1]

We find, too, the most unmistakable recognition of the doctrine of the Apostolical succession in the writings of the first Latin Father, Tertullian, who says of the heretics of his own age: 'Let them exhibit the origins of their Churches, let them unfold the order of their bishops successively coming down from the beginning, so that their first bishop may have as his author and predecessor one of the Apostles, or of those Apostolic men who were continually with the Apostles; for in this way the Apostolic Churches bring down their lists.'[2]

There can therefore be no manner of doubt that within a generation of the last of the Apostles, Episcopacy was recognised not only as a form of Church government, but as the distinguishing characteristic of the Church as contrasted with those heretical and schismatical bodies, which had even then sprung up along side of it.

We may freely admit that during the lifetime of the Apostles the Churches were governed by elders—that is priests (*πρεσβύτεροι* and *ἐπίσκοποι*) under Apostolic direction, and that Episcopacy did not make its way simultaneously to every Church; but that its beginnings may be traced in Apostolic times, and that

[1] S. Ignat., *Ep. ad Philadelph.* 3, 4; Migne, *P. G.* v. col. 700. Cf. also *Ep. ad Smyrn.* viii. Οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστι χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, οὔτε βαπτίζειν, οὔτε προσφέρειν, οὔτε θυσίαν προσκομίζειν, οὔτε δοχὴν ἐπιτελεῖν. Migne, *P. G.* v. col. 852.

[2] Tert., *De Præscrip.* 32; Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 44, 45.

in the second century it was recognised, in Churches so far apart as Antioch and Carthage, as an essential characteristic of the Catholic Church, is an established historical fact.

While the doctrine of Apostolical succession is recognised by the Roman, Eastern, and Anglican branches of the Church to-day as absolutely essential to lawful ministry in the Church, and to the validity of the Sacraments, it is quite naturally rejected by the various Protestant bodies, who forfeited an Apostolic ministry when they separated from the Church, and who cannot regain it except on the condition of reunion with the Church. As this doctrine is one of the principal obstacles to reunion with the various sects, and is much misunderstood and misrepresented, it may be advisable to devote some space to explaining, not *what* it is (which does not need explanation), but *why* it is.

We ought to begin by acknowledging that much of the prejudice against it is the result of the way it has been taught, of the theory of priesthood put forth (especially by the Church of Rome). In it a sharp division is made between priests and laity, as, though priests were a caste or class through whom alone the laity must approach God. A corollary to this is that the priesthood exists to celebrate sacrifices or acts of worship in the place of the body of the people, or as their substitute, and that the laity are not called to so high a standard of Christian life as are priests.[1] It was this teaching, carried to an extreme, which was responsible for much of the reaction against Sacerdotalism, or priestcraft, as it was called, at the Reformation.

As we shall endeavour to show, the theory has elements of truth in it, but is only partial truth at best, and has in it also much that is dangerously untrue.

[1] Cf. Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, chap. iii.

It would not be historically accurate to trace the theory we have described simply to sacerdotal encroachment and self-interest; it has been occasioned probably quite as much by the positive unwillingness of the laity to fulfil their duty as members of the Church, and to live according to the standard of Christianity taught in the Gospels. They were quite as ready to get their duty done by proxy, and to provide a substitute for personal service in the Church of Christ, as was the priesthood to gain power by accepting this position.

At the Reformation there was much clamour about the priesthood of the laity which had been usurped by the clergy of the Church, and in our own day we find the same outcry among Sectarians of all sorts.

The claim that there is a priesthood of the laity is entirely valid, but it does not in the slightest degree supersede the need of the sacerdotal ministries of the Church, and it does involve responsibilities, as we have shown, which Sectarians probably do not realise and certainly do not fulfil.

The Church is a priestly body; all the members therefore in a sense partake of a priestly character,[1] in that all have their share in offering the Christian sacrifice, which the priest offers, not in their stead, but as their representative and organ. This we shall see best by an investigation of the nature and character of the Church as the Body of Christ.

We have already pointed out[2] that body and spirit are inseparable and necessarily related parts of the Church; that the order in which the Articles on the Holy Spirit and on the Church follow one another in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds implies that the Church is the manifestation on earth of the work of the Holy Spirit; and that as the Body of Christ, it cannot live or act apart from the Spirit of Christ, by which it is informed and energised.

[1] 1 S. Pet. ii. 9. [2] Pp. 227, 228.

But we may go a step further. While there is but one Body and one Spirit, the *organs* of that one Body are many,[1] the *gifts* of that one Spirit are diverse.[2] This is the great subject of chapter xii. of S. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, and as we know, that Epistle was called forth by dissensions and disorders among the parties in the Church of Corinth, which bear some resemblance to the differences amongst religious parties in England to-day.

After dealing with the relation of the one Spirit to the one Body,[3] S. Paul says, 'For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased Him.'[4]

To confine ourselves to S. Paul's illustration, we have the Church put before us as one body composed of many members, certain of which are *organs* performing necessary functions for the well-being of the whole body. But these organs do not confer life on the body—indeed they depend absolutely on the one life of the body. At the moment after death the eye still retains all its marvellous parts unimpaired, the lens, the retina, the optic nerve; but the life has departed, and the eye is therefore useless to the body and to itself.

The life of the eye is the life of the body specialised for a particular functional purpose, and yet it would be quite untrue to say that its capacity for seeing was conferred upon it at the will, or by the act, of the

[1] Rom. xii. 4.
[2] 1 Cor. xii. 4.
[3] 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13.
[4] 1 Cor. xii. 14-19.

body. No; S. Paul says that it is 'God [who] hath set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased Him.'[1]

Nor can the body dispense with the eye, nor, if it is wanting, can all the rest of the body put together supply its place by discharging the function it was meant to discharge.

What follows in applying this argument to the doctrine of priesthood in the Church? Surely this: that the priesthood is an organ of the body, not having a life apart from or in place of the body, but having the life of the body specialised for the function of priesthood. Further, that as the body does not and cannot create or produce at will its organs, and cannot replace them when they are lost, so the priesthood is not derived from *below* by the will and action of other members of the body, but from *above* by the will and action of God, who 'set the members every one of them in the body, as it pleased Him.'

This is the true principle of priesthood, and removes many of the objections which are ignorantly brought against sacerdotalism: the transmission of priesthood by Apostolical succession is simply a matter of history.

The method, prevalent among some of the sects, of a congregation choosing and appointing its minister *might have been* the method instituted by our Lord in His Church; but so far as Holy Scripture and history teach us (and we have no other guides) *it was not*. For although in Apostolic times there are indications of ordination 'by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery,'[2] this presbytery consisted, as the word implies, of presbyters (priests), *not laymen*; and if the authority to ordain was afterwards, by the guidance of the Holy Ghost, confined to a bishop together with presbyters, so that ordination by presbyters alone was no longer allowed, this does not in

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 18. [2] 1 Tim. iv. 14.

the least do away with the necessity of Apostolical Succession. Because presbyters, who possessed the power to ordain, could limit the exercise of that power to one of their number who already possessed it, it does not follow that laity, who possess no such power, can perpetuate a valid ministry.

Indeed, it seems as unreasonable to suppose that a congregation of individuals, none of whom possess the power of ministry, can together confer what none of them possesses, as to suppose that all the members of the human body together can confer on some one member or organ a function which they themselves do not possess, *e.g.* can confer on the *ear* the function of *sight.*

What, however, has often been overlooked by members of the Church, is that the loss of an *organ* does not always involve the loss of *life.* It is very wonderful how, in the case of the blind, other faculties, such as hearing and touch, are sharpened and developed to supply to some extent the lost sense; but this is scarcely an argument for dispensing with eyes. Where sight is lost life may go on, and useful life; but it is life which has its limitations, not perfect life. We pity the blind man and add to our pity admiration that he accomplishes so much in spite of his great limitations; and this, it would seem, should be our attitude to those who do not possess an Apostolic ministry. Instead of regarding them with contempt, we should ungrudgingly recognise and admire the holy lives and great works which are produced under such serious limitations.

We shall conclude this subject by briefly examining the three views which are held in regard to the basis of the Christian ministry.

1. That 'mission' or divine appointment to the ministry manifests itself solely within the individual conscience of the man who is called, and requires no further confirmation.

2. That this witness in the individual conscience must be accompanied by appointment on the part of the Church body, or of some adequate part thereof.

3. That no one can be held to be divinely commissioned until he have received authority from such as themselves received it in like manner from others, implying continuous transmission from the Apostles who were themselves commissioned by Jesus Christ.

The first is the claim of but few, the second of the majority of the sects; the last is the teaching of the Church and really comprehends the other two, adding only that doctrine of Apostolical succession which we find set forth by Tertullian at the close of the second century as the distinguishing feature of the true Church. For the Church requires first an interior vocation, asking of the ordinand, 'Do you think in your heart that you be truly called?' then the public examination of the candidate, with the statement that the ordinand is found to be 'lawfully called' and 'meet' for the ministry, opportunity being given for any one to allege an impediment if it be known; and lastly, after these two calls, the interior call 'in the heart' and the exterior or 'lawful' call of the Church, have been certified to, the Apostolic transmission of the gift of priesthood follows, the bishop laying on his hands with the form prescribed in the Ordinal.

To reject the doctrine of Apostolical succession, we may at least say, is certainly a most rash and unwarranted procedure, which, according to the teaching of the Roman, Greek, and Anglican Churches, together making up all historic Christianity, invalidates the ministries of those who take this position.

ii. We have yet to draw attention to a much neglected aspect of the life of the Church of Christ. The Church possesses not only an Apostolic ministry, but certain spiritual endowments upon the use of which much of its work depends. A careful reader

of Holy Scripture cannot but be struck by the extraordinary manifestations of the Holy Ghost which are referred to in S. Paul's Epistles, as though they formed part of the ordinary life of the Church in his day. Not only, he tells us, has the one body many members, but the one Spirit bestows upon these members a diversity of gifts.[1] We have no less than four lists of these gifts—in the Epistles to the Romans, Ephesians, and two in the Corinthians.[2]

Before we examine them, let us for a moment return to the description of the Church as the Body of Christ.

In addition to the organs of his body, a man has certain endowments, which we ordinarily speak of as 'gifts,' *e.g.* the artistic gift for drawing or painting, a talent for music or for teaching, or for administration, etc. Now it is quite evident that these gifts belong not to the body but to the spiritual or intellectual part of the man. One who has a gift for music or for colour has not, therefore, a keener sense of hearing or of sight; the gift is not a development of the organ of the body, but belongs rather to the mind. So we find that in addition to the organs of the body in which the life of the one body is specialised for certain functional purposes, as for priesthood, the members of Christ's body are endowed with various gifts which we are told belong to the one Spirit. These gifts are bestowed not so much for the sanctification of the recipient, as for the edification of the Church. For we read, 'He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; *for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.*'[3]

These 'gifts' are distinguished in Holy Scripture from 'grace' by the use of a different form of the

[1] 1 Cor xii. 4.
[2] Rom. xii. 6-9; Eph. iv. 11, 12; 1 Cor. xii. 8-11, and 28.
[3] Eph. iv. 11, 12.

same word: gifts are *χαρίσματα*, grace is *χάρις*. So theologians distinguish between the 'gratia gratis data' and the 'gratia gratum faciens': the first corresponds to *χαρίσματα*, and the latter to *χάρις*. This twofold division depends upon the end or purpose for which the grace is given. The first (*charismata*) is given to man principally for the edification of others, and can exist even when the recipient is in mortal sin, as the power to work miracles and the gifts of the Apostolate were possessed by Judas, and the gifts of priesthood are possessed even by an unworthy priest. The latter (*χάρις*) is given chiefly for a man's own sanctification, and is called 'gratia gratum faciens' because it makes its possessor pleasing or acceptable to God. The former is called 'gratia gratis data' because it is given irrespective of the deserts of the recipient, and chiefly 'for the edifying of the body of Christ.'

It is evident that the *gifts* of priesthood come under this head, but that this by no means exhausts the charismata. By carefully comparing the four lists to which we have referred, we find a relation between them, the same gift, however, appearing in some lists under a different name.

In the first list in Corinthians we have nine charismata: wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, working miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, kinds of tongues, and interpretation of tongues. In the second list we have eight: apostles, prophets, teachers, workers of miracles, gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. In that in Romans we have seven: prophecy, ministry, teaching, exhortation, distribution, ruling, healing. In that in Ephesians we find only five: apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers.

These charismata are not confined to the organised ministry of the Church; they may be found among

laymen, and are many of them exhibited in a marked degree among the sects; and to these gifts must be attributed much of the work for Christ, which is undoubtedly done by them.

These gifts were manifested most actively during the first ages of the Church; afterward they seem to have given place to the ordinary organised ministry of the Church, though sporadically exhibited by individuals, especially in periods of religious revival, and associated with great religious movements: *e.g.* some of them were manifested in a marked degree by S. Benedict, S. Francis Assisi, Savonarola, S. Ignatius, S. Francis of Sales, S. Vincent of Paul, and others. They were displayed in the great Catholic revival of our own day, and they are to be looked for, and prayed for, as among the great endowments of the Church of Christ.

A comparison of the two passages by which the charismata are introduced in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Romans seems to imply that while to each one is given that grace (gratia gratum faciens) which is necessary to his individual sanctification, this grace is generally accompanied by some charismata by which he may edify the body of Christ, and do his work as a faithful and useful member of that body. The passage in the Ephesians is, 'But unto *every one of us* is given *grace* according to the measure of the *gift* of Christ';[1] that in the Romans reads: 'Having then *gifts* (charismata) differing according to the *grace* that is given to us.'[2] From this it would seem to follow that it behoves each member of the body to ask himself what gifts have been bestowed on him? what talent he is responsible for using to the edifying of the Church? Without attempting an examination of all the charismata mentioned by S. Paul, we may point out that—

[1] Eph. iv. 7. [2] Rom. xii. 6.

(1) Prophecy is not necessarily confined to the priesthood, for we see it exercised within the Church by laymen, especially in the lay preaching of S. Francis Assisi and his friars.

(2) Ministry may be seen in mission-work among the poor and outcast by many of our lay workers to-day.

(3) Teaching is manifested in Sunday-school work, and in helping to prepare the ignorant for the sacraments.

(4) Distribution is exercised in the man of wealth giving of his means, and with this his time and experience, for special works in the Church.

(5) Healing is practised in the work of the Christian nurse ministering to the sick and suffering in our hospitals, and in the homes of the poor.

How tremendous would be the power of the Church, if each member by prayer and experiment strove to find out what charismata had been bestowed upon him, and then used his gifts for the glory of God and the edifying of the body of Christ!

iii. There remains for us to point out the four principal functions of the Church as the Guardian and Teacher of Truth, the Guide in Morals, the Dispenser of Grace, and the Director of Worship.

1. The Church is the Guardian and Teacher of Truth.

S. Paul calls the Church 'the pillar and ground of the truth';[1] but what is truth? Minds differ, and philosophers disagree. What reason, then, have we to claim that the Church is the Teacher of truth? The claim of the Gospel itself; for in it our Lord Jesus Christ says of Himself, 'I am the Truth,'[2] and 'to this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice';[3] and again, to the seventy, He said, 'He that heareth you, heareth Me';[4] and to His Apostles, 'When He,

[1] 1 Tim. iii. 15.
[2] S. John xiv. 6.
[3] S. John xviii. 37.
[4] S. Luke x. 16.

the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth';[1] and to S. Peter, 'Upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it';[2] and yet once more, 'Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.'[3] The Christian, then, has in the Church, which our Lord founded on the rock of His Divinity, an unerring teacher of truth. The Church, however, has not for its sphere to teach man what he can find out for himself—that is, she has no commission to teach those laws of the physical world which are commonly called scientific truth. The truth committed to her is that knowledge which can make man wise unto salvation, and which is the subject-matter of revelation. She is therefore the Giver and Interpreter of Holy Scripture, the books of the Bible being accepted on the authority of the Church, and the meaning of their contents being elucidated by her teaching. Her methods of teaching have already been considered under the head of 'Faith.'[4]

2. The Church is the Guide in Morals.

In morals the Church claims to promulgate the laws and principles which must guide human conduct, and this claim is closely allied to her claim to be the teacher of truth; for we must first believe rightly or we cannot act rightly. The world has its science of ethics, but its history is a history of discord; for the various schools of ethics cannot even agree on any one basis of morals, or that, in fact, morals have any basis.

A well-known writer says: 'In one sense, moralists are almost unanimous; in another they are hopelessly discordant. They are unanimous in pronouncing certain classes of conduct to be right, and the opposite wrong. No moralist denies that cruelty, falsehood,

[1] S. John xvi. 13.
[2] S. Matt. xvi. 18.
[3] S. John viii. 32.
[4] Cf. pp. 108-110.

and intemperance are vicious; or that mercy, truth, and temperance are virtuous. . . . But if we turn from the matter to the form of morality; if instead of asking what actions are right or wrong, we ask, What is the *essence* of right and wrong? how do we know right from wrong? why should we seek the right and eschew the wrong?—we are presented with the most contradictory answers; we find ourselves at once in that region of perpetual antinomies, where controversy is everlasting, and opposite theories seem to be equally self-evident to different minds.'[1]

Here a scientific writer, quite unbiassed on the side of the Church or of religion, confesses at the outset of his treatise on morals, that while there may be some consent regarding what is right and what is wrong, there is absolutely no agreement concerning the *basis* of morality, why things are right or why they are wrong. And when he flatters himself that there is some unanimity in the *matter* of morals, is he not too sanguine? For while those particular things which he mentions—cruelty, falsehood, and intemperance—may be universally accepted in the abstract, there is no agreement whatever in their application to concrete cases—no agreement whatever apart from the law of human conduct which the Church lays down.

The writer we have quoted admits that all systems of morals are in hopeless disagreement on three points: (1) What is the essence of right and wrong, or the *basis* of ethics? (2) How do we know right from wrong, or the *standard* of morals? and (3) Why should we seek the right and eschew the wrong, or the *necessity* of ethics?

The Church has no hesitation in answering: (1) that the basis of ethics is God's Will, revealed to man. Things are right because God has revealed that they are His Will, and wrong because He has forbidden

[1] Leslie Stephen, *Science of Ethics*, pp. 1, 2.

them. (2) The Church's standard of morals is the life and teachings of Jesus Christ; and (3) The necessity of morals depends on man's eternal relation to God, as his Creator and his End.

On these principles the Church has ruled on all questions of human conduct.

3. The Church is the Dispenser of Grace.

To the Church is committed the ministration of the Word and Sacraments, by which man is supplied with grace for all his needs. By her standard of morals the Church teaches her children what is right, and through her Sacraments supplies them with strength to carry this into effect.

4. The Church is the Director of Worship.

Our Blessed Lord founded His Church not only to teach man truth, and to guide man in morals, and to dispense to man grace, *but also to direct man how to worship God acceptably.* This is not the least important of the Church's functions; for to teach men how to worship God rightly is to prepare them for that life in heaven, which will be one long unbroken act of worship.

II. Of the Communion of Saints.

This clause was the last addition to the Apostles Creed as we now have it, and was introduced in the fifth century.

i. It is found, as we have seen,[1] in the Creed of Faustus of Riez (*c.* 460), as reconstructed from his *De Spiritu Sancto* and his two homilies on the Creed, and Harnack in his work, *Das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss*, published in 1892, claims this as its first appearance in a Creed form. It, is however, found in an *Explanatio symboli*, attributed to Nicetas of Aquileia, but which is now generally accepted as a sermon of Nicetas of

[1] P. 44.

Remesiana, who, according to Gennadius of Marseilles, seems to have lived in the fourth and fifth centuries (*c.* 370-420), and to have been the Nicetas who was the friend of Paulinus of Nola.[1] In this sermon we find for the first time the phrase 'sanctorum communionem'; but whether it belongs to the Creed he is explaining, or to the explanation itself, is difficult to decide. The passage is: 'What is the Church but the congregation of all Saints? . . . Believe then that in this one Church you will attain the *Communion of Saints*.'[2]

Harnack in his later Article on the Creed, in the third edition of the *Hauck-Herzog Real-Encyclopädie*, considers it improbable that it belongs to the Creed itself, and suggests that from the acquaintance with the Catechetical lectures of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, which Nicetas manifests, the phrase may have been borrowed from S. Cyril. Whether, however, it passed into the Creed of Gaul from Nicetas or originated in Gaul on account of the heresy of Vigilantius, is an open question.

In his earlier work Harnack puts forth the latter view with some confidence, and it seems to us the most probable opinion; for even if the phrase were borrowed from the sermon of Nicetas, the occasion which led to its introduction in the Creed of the Church of Southern Gaul may have been the prevalence of the heresy of Vigilantius[3] in that neighbourhood and in Spain, of which we have independent evidence.

Vigilantius denied that the Saints in glory pray for the living, and the article on the Communion of Saints appears to have been intended to refute this denial.

As Zahn points out, the passage in Nicetas does not by 'Saints' mean those who are now on earth; the use of the future tense, and indeed the whole context, shows that he refers to those who have passed into the

[1] Paulin. Nol. *Ep.* xxix. 14; Migne, *P. L.* lxi. col. 321.
[2] Cf. p. 44, note.
[3] Cf. p. 45.

world beyond. Zahn quotes from two interesting sermons wrongly attributed to S. Augustine.[1] In the first the phrase 'sanctorum communionem' is explained of 'the saints who died in the faith which we receive'; in the second it is referred to a spiritual community of goods in heaven.

ii. There seem to have been three views of the teaching of this Article.

(1) That to which we have just referred, which Harnack considered was almost undoubtedly the original teaching, since it is that set forth in the sermon on the Creed by Faustus of Riez, who is our first *certain* authority for the Article as part of the Creed of the Church of Southern Gaul.

(2) That which would confine the fellowship to members of the Church still living in the world.

(3) That which would take 'sanctorum' as neuter, and so make the fellowship to consist in communion through participation in the Eucharist.

The last view seems to have originated in the twelfth century,[2] and is at best mediæval and lacking in antiquity; it was apparently confined to a few writers in France, and so also lacks both catholicity and consent. It seems to have been revived by Zahn in our own day, but has met with but little favour from others.[3]

The second view is found in the African Church about the year 400, when it was used (in the Donatist controversy) of communion with the orthodox, 'Communionen Sanctorum' being equivalent to 'Ecclesia Catholica.'

It is, however, remarkable that *not one* of the old commentators on the Creed gives this meaning of the

[1] Pseudo-Aug. Sermo. ccxlii.; Migne, *P. L.* xxxix. col. 2193. Sermo. ccxl., *ibid.*, col. 2189. [2] Cf. p.

[3] Zahn, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 196-200; cf. also Dr. Sanday in *Journal of Theological Studies* for October 1901.

Article, and as it was not part of the African Creed in S. Augustine's time, this use of the phrase can have little weight in deciding the meaning of the clause in the Creed, especially in the light of its manifest application to the Saints in heaven, both in Nicetas and Faustus, our earliest authorities for it.

Besides, to narrow the 'Saints' to those on earth is surely a most inadequate connotation of the title 'Saint.'

We have therefore left the first view, which would recognise a Communion with the Saints in heaven, though we need not restrict this to the application, found in the Sermon of Faustus, to the cultus of the Saints.

The Church, as we have seen, though existing now in three states, Militant, Expectant, and Triumphant, is essentially one body. And in a body, as S. Paul insists, there can be no 'schism'[1] between the members, but 'the members have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member rejoice, all the members rejoice with it.' And further, that 'the whole body [is] fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth.'[2]

Hence the Communion of Saints, that is the fellowship of the whole Church, is strictly in analogy with the functions of a body. For as in the human body the life-blood circulates through every member, supplying it with nourishment and uniting it with the rest of the body; so in the Church does the same Holy Spirit circulate in every member, sanctifying every part, for the Saints are the fruits of the Holy Ghost.

In this fellowship of the whole Church we may recognise:—

(1) A fellowship of interest and hope in the final triumph of the Church, and therefore, of its Head

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 25, 26. [2] Eph. iv. 16.

Jesus Christ, when the number of the elect shall be made up, and 'God' shall be 'all in all.'[1]

(2) A fellowship of work, all working for the glory of God and the common good of the whole body.

(3) A fellowship of prayer.

In the Church militant each prays for all, and all for each member; this would include also a fellowship in the Sacraments, and especially in the Eucharist. The Church militant, too, prays for the faithful departed, that they may have light, rest, and refreshment. S. Augustine teaches us that we may aid them not only by our prayers, but by offering the Holy Eucharist and by Alms-giving. He says, 'There can be no doubt that the dead are helped by the prayers of the Holy Church, by the life-giving sacrifice, and by the alms which are offered for them, to such an extent that they are treated by the Lord more leniently than their own sins have deserved.'[2] This is the authoritative teaching alike of East[3] and West.[4]

Moreover, it is witnessed to by the instincts of natural religion, by Holy Scripture, and by the testimony of the Catacombs.

The Church on earth honours the Saints in heaven by keeping their feast days, and she also asks for their prayers.

The invocation of the *prayers* of the Saints may be direct or indirect—that is, we may ask the Saints directly to pray for us, or we may ask God to grant us a share in the intercession of the Saints.

The authority for invocation of the prayers of the Saints is overwhelming. In the Roman Catacombs we find a very large number of such prayers addressed directly to individual Saints.

We find also invocation in the works of Origen,

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 28.
[2] S. Aug. Sermo. clxxii. 2; Migne, *P. L.* xxxviii. col. 936.
[3] *Orthodox. Confess. Quest*, 65.
[4] C. of Trent, Sess. 25.

S. Gregory of Nyssa, S. Gregory of Nazianzus, S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostom, S. Basil, and S. Jerome, etc.[1] S. Jerome's work, *Contra Vigilantium*, is in defence of the practice.

That the practice has been grievously abused is undeniable, but so have many helpful practices in the Church, and 'the abuse of a thing taketh not away its lawful use.'

The holy dead in the intermediate state are not only the objects of our prayers, but probably they pray for us, and for the final coming of Christ's Kingdom.

While the Saints in heaven still care for the other members of the body, as S. Paul implies,[2] probably they watch us in our struggles here, striving to help us by their prayers. The passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 'Seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses,'[3] has generally been taken to point to this. And if it be asked, How do the Saints see us and know our needs and that we ask their prayers? while we cannot answer this with any certainty, yet the most common opinion of theologians has been that the Saints see us 'in the Word,' or, as some have expressed it, 'in the mirror of the Holy Trinity'; that is, beholding the Vision of God in heaven, they see in God, not absolutely all things, but all that God wills them to know, and all that it is necessary for their happiness that they should know, and among these things are the interests and struggles of the Church on earth.

[1] For a catena of patristic authorities cf. Perrone, *Tract. de Cultu S.S.*, cap. iii. prop. 2, ed. Migne, tom. i.; Petavius, *De Incarn.* lib. xiv. cap. 10, col. 1180-1193; Forbes, *XXXIX Articles*, pp. 377-422.

[2] 1 Cor. xii. 25, 26. [3] Heb. xii. 1.

CHAPTER X

ARTICLE X

The Forgiveness of Sins.—*Apostles' Creed.*

I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins.—*Nicene Creed.*

Of the Forgiveness of Sins.

Two words which are most familiar, and seem most simple, and yet about which the gravest misapprehension exists—'Sin' and 'Forgiveness'! Many would say, surely these words need no explanation; every one knows what 'sin' is and what 'forgiveness' is; but, as is often the case, what we assume that every one knows is precisely that about which there is the most general ignorance.

If we knew what sin was, could we go on sinning? if we understood what forgiveness involved, could we so easily assume that we were forgiven?

None, of course, can adequately comprehend the malice of sin, regarded either as an act of rebellion against God or as an act of self-destruction, an attempt to kill all that is best in ourselves; but it may help us in our penitence to that 'godly sorrow [which] worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of,'[1] that is, to such sorrow as shall ensure forgiveness of our sin, if we turn our thoughts in the consideration of this Article of the Creed to the seriousness of sin and of forgiveness.

[1] 2 Cor. vii. 10.

I. What is sin? S. John tells us that it is the transgression of the law.[1] In the Bible, in the Church, and in our conscience, God has written His holy law, and when we wilfully transgress this we sin.

This seems very simple, but some have suggested that no one *wilfully* sins; for that we cannot help ourselves in the matter. And this comes from two most opposite sources. On the one hand, the Calvinist, with his doctrine of predestination and election, practically denies any real exercise of free-will, and therefore of human responsibility; on the other, the rationalist tells us that heredity and environment leave no room for free-will, that the forces of birth and circumstances control absolutely our actions.

It is sufficient here to point out that if either of these views were true we could have no responsibility for what we do; for we cannot be responsible for that which we cannot control. But they are not true, for Holy Scripture, from which Calvinists think they deduce their doctrine of election, clearly teaches, again and again, that God holds man accountable for his actions, and this implies free-will or the power of choice of good and evil.

In regard to the position of rationalists—mysterious as free-will is, and difficult to think out—man by his own laws and by his own life bears witness to his conviction that the will is free, since everywhere man is held responsible for what he does, both in the intercourse of social life and in the law which protects society. Human law, indeed, in punishing the criminal for theft, murder, etc., proceeds on the assumption that the criminal is responsible and has free-will. This is evidenced by the fact that, if the plea of insanity can be proved, the punishment is not inflicted on the express ground that the person is irresponsible.

Sin, then, is an act of the will. That sovereign

[1] 1 S. John iii. 4.

power of the soul by which man is able to choose good or evil is exercised in the choice of evil; that great gift of God, free-will, by which man is distinguished from all other creatures, is used to rebel against God, his Creator and King, to disobey His commands, to break His laws; and the greatness of the outrage may be measured by the distance between the dignity of the King and the littleness of the subject who rebels, and thus measured it is seen to be infinite.

While the malice of sin consists first in its being an act of rebellion against God, it is not exhausted by this, but may be estimated too by its effects upon man himself. Man by sinning strikes with his puny arm at God, but the blow falls really upon himself; for sin destroys all that is best in man. It wounds every power of his soul, clouding his intellect, poisoning his imagination, deadening the voice of conscience, weakening his will; and it stops not at the soul: its effects are seen often, as clearly, in the body in the manifold diseases to which it is subject. If towards God sin may be described as an attempt at deicide, an attempt which only fails, and fails absolutely, from man's own impotence, towards man himself it is an attempt at suicide; for if indulged in sufficiently it ends in killing all that is godlike in man, all that is truly human, and so it becomes an act of suicide, for by sin a man murders his true self.

It is most difficult for us to obtain true views of the seriousness of sin, but to help us we have two revelations of God's view of sin. The first is the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ—read there in all He suffered for man God's view of sin. The other, less pathetic, but in a sense more awful, is the revelation of hell—a revelation from the lips of the tender loving Lord Himself, Who died to take away our sins. In these two revelations we have set before us in plainest terms God's view of sin.

II. What is forgiveness? Is it a mere remission of punishment, an ignoring of guilt, or condoning it? It is of course the remission of penalty; but surely this does not exhaust its meaning, nor adequately express it. In what category must we place 'forgiveness'? Is it a virtue or only an amiable weakness? Is it the characteristic of the saintly and strong man, or of the man who either has no hatred for sin, or not sufficient energy to manifest it? Does it consist in the power of persuading oneself that guilt may be condoned or that sin is a light matter? Is it consistent with abhorrence of evil, with love of truth and justice?

Since in the Creed we attribute forgiveness of sins to God, it must be an accompaniment of holiness and truth and justice and strength, and consistent with a hatred of sin; for all these belong to God. It must be a virtue, and a virtue of the highest class, and altogether removed from weakness, or indifference to sin. It must, therefore, be something more than mere remission of punishment, since under certain circumstances remission of punishment is inconsistent with any of the attributes, which we have just recognised as belonging to God.

There are occasions when remission of punishment is no act of kindness to the offender, when indeed it only destroys his sense of right and wrong, the little realisation he has of the evil of sin, when it is indeed only an encouragement to go on sinning. At such times forgiveness would be an immoral act, and the infliction of penalty the truest exhibition of love.

In order, then, that forgiveness may be a virtue, it must take into account its own moral effect upon the recipient, upon the offender who is to be forgiven. Will it stimulate him to do right hereafter? will it aid in his moral restoration? or will it be regarded only as a condonation of sin, as an incentive to go on sinning?

Mercy has been defined in its relation to Justice as

the recognition of possibilities of restoration in a character already far gone towards sin, and if we accept this definition we shall see that there can be no conflict between God's attributes of Mercy and Justice, that they are but two aspects of the same attribute; since Justice is the recognition on the part of God, who knows what is in man, that in certain souls there are no further possibilities of restoration; therefore Justice and Mercy alike are in God simply the recognition of the true state of a human soul. So long as there is room for Mercy it will be extended by God, who is All-Merciful. When that condition no longer exists, the Justice of God will take effect, that is, will pronounce the soul to be what it is, what it has made itself, what Mercy cannot unmake it. This definition of Mercy may be extended to forgiveness.

Forgiveness, therefore, must depend upon the recipient being forgivable, that is, still possessing the possibility of restoration. It is not the mere arbitrary pronouncing of a sentence irrespective of the facts of the case, or, rather, of the condition of the offender.

Under this head we must carefully examine certain passages of Holy Scripture, in which our Lord teaches us the duty of forgiveness.

In the Sermon on the Mount our Lord said: 'For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.'[1] In this passage our Lord clearly teaches that God's forgiveness is conditioned by a certain disposition in the recipient, and this condition—the forgiveness of others—implies charity; for we cannot love God and hate our brother, and to be in charity with our neighbour is the best test of our love towards God.[2]

[1] S. Matt. vi. 14-15; cf. also xviii. 35, and S. Luke vi. 37.
[2] S. John iv. 7, 11, 20, 21.

In S Matthew, chapter xviii., and in the parallel passage in S. Luke, we find some very full instruction on the duty of forgiveness; the two passages need to be read together to appreciate it. In S. Matthew we are told that in answer to S. Peter's question, 'Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times?' Jesus replied, 'I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but, Until seventy times seven';[1] but in S. Luke it is recorded that He said, 'Take heed to yourselves: If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. And if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him.'[2] In the passage in S. Luke the repentance of the one who has sinned is expressly mentioned, and may be considered as a condition of his forgiveness. While it is not explicitly spoken of in the passage we have quoted from S. Matthew, it is implied in what has gone before: 'Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: *if he shall hear thee* (*i.e.* if he repent), thou hast gained thy brother';[3] and still more strikingly is there brought out the need of a right disposition in the recipient of forgiveness in the parable which follows from, and illustrates our Lord's answer to S. Peter. The whole parable should be read; in it the unmerciful servant, who seeks and obtains forgiveness, by his conduct to his fellow-servant, shows that he has not the disposition required for forgiveness, and the forgiveness which he has obtained is withdrawn, while the lesson of the parable is enforced in the words, 'So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.'[4]

[1] S. Matt. xviii. 21, 22.
[2] S. Luke xvii. 3, 4.
[3] S. Matt. xviii. 15.
[4] S. Matt. xviii. 35.

From all these passages we learn, that for a man to be forgiven he must be forgivable, that is, he must have in him the possibilities of restoration; forgiveness without this cannot benefit him, because it does not change him, as we see in the parable.

A clearer grasp of what forgiveness implies in the recipient would go far towards removing a common, though unthinking, objection to the doctrine of eternal punishment. It is often put thus: 'I cannot believe that God, Who is love, and Who has revealed that we are to forgive, not seven times, but seventy times, can Himself ever refuse to forgive any sinner however grievously and perseveringly he may have sinned. I cannot believe that God, therefore, will allow any one to be lost, when by the exercise of Mercy in forgiving such an one he would be saved.'

The reply to this objection might take some such form as this. There is indeed no limit to God's mercy, He is ever ready to forgive those who are forgivable, to save all who are salvable, but God's forgiveness does not make a man what he is not, does not unmake what he has made himself. Salvation is freely offered to all, but the acceptance of it implies the power to appropriate it on man's part, and that power may have been destroyed by a man's own wilful choice of sin. God gives to all the light of the sun, but to those who have destroyed the faculty of sight the gift is useless, and they must remain in darkness though light be all around them.[1]

In reflecting upon this Article of the Creed we must strive to realise the malice of sin, strive to grasp what forgiveness involves on our part, in order—not that we may despair of it—that we may ensure it.

III. In the Nicene Creed we profess our belief 'in

[1] Cf. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, chap. iii., to which the Author desires to express his obligation.

one Baptism for the remission of sins,' and this brings before us the *means* by which forgiveness may be obtained and sin remitted.

The means whereby sin is remitted is primarily the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, or, as Holy Scripture puts it, His Precious Blood—'the Blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin.'[1]

The ordinary channel through which the Blood of Christ is applied to the soul is the Sacraments, especially Baptism, Penance, and the Holy Eucharist.

Born in original sin, that is, with a tainted nature derived from the first Adam, and, in the case of adults, guilty also of many actual transgressions, Baptism is the means by which all sin is remitted, and more—by which many good gifts are bestowed upon the soul.

The expression '*one* Baptism' was probably introduced into the Creed from the passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians, 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism,'[2] but it also reminds us that Baptism cannot be repeated, that we can receive its grace but once. Hence since it is of such imperative necessity, and since in some cases it is possible for doubts to arise (especially in regard to Baptism received in infancy) both in regard to the fact of its reception and to its validity, if received, the Church has provided a conditional form to be used in such cases: 'If thou art not already baptized, N., I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.'

Baptism is one of those Sacraments which cannot be repeated, because it conveys *character*, the character of the child of God, which is indelible, and which therefore can never be lost, even though, through sin, the soul be deprived of sanctifying grace, and cut off from union with God. The other Sacraments

[1] 1 S. John i. 7. [2] Eph. iv. 5.

which convey character are Confirmation and Holy Orders.

The special grace of Baptism is the Gift of Regeneration, or New-birth, the implanting in us of the Christ-life, the first quickening of the spiritual life.

This grace carries with it the grace of Justification or Sanctification, whereby all sin, both original and actual, is remitted—not only the guilt, but the eternal punishment due to sin, and the temporal punishment due to the individual (though not such consequences as are proper to human nature). In the case of adults the remission of actual sin is conditional on their faith and repentance. On one baptized without these dispositions the character of Baptism is bestowed, and potentially the distinctive grace of the Sacrament, Regeneration, but the graces are inoperative until penitence has removed the obstacle of sin.

In Baptism, too, there is an infusion of sanctifying grace by which the soul is made pleasing to God, and an infusion of the virtues of Faith, Hope, and Love, with the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

The baptized becomes the temple of the Holy Ghost, Who then takes up his personal dwelling in the soul.[1]

The Gift of Regeneration incorporates us into the Body of Christ, and makes us by adoption the children of God.

The effects of Baptism are indeed wonderful, transforming the natural man into a spiritual man,'[2] and endowing him with all the gifts and graces of the spiritual life.

If, however, Baptism were the only channel by which the Precious Blood of Christ could be applied to the soul, the salvation of most Christians would be more than doubtful. Our Blessed Lord, therefore, provided what the Fathers often speak of as the second plank in shipwreck (perhaps the earliest use of this simile being

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 19; cf. iii. 16. [2] Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 14-16.

found in Tertullian[1])—the Sacrament of Penance, instituted on Easter Day, when 'He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.'[2]

That the power to administer this Sacrament has been given to the ministers of the Church we are daily reminded in the form of Absolution in Morning and Evening Prayer; that the Sacrament is to be sought under certain circumstances is affirmed in the Exhortation in the Communion Office; and in the only office provided in our Prayer Book for ministering to individual souls is the direction given that 'the sick person be *moved* to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter.' After which confession the priest is ordered to absolve him, a very solemn and direct form of Absolution being provided.

The Church of England thus clearly recognises this second sacramental channel for the remission of post-baptismal sins.

[1] 'Eam (pœnitentiam) tu peccator, mei similis, ita invade, ita amplexare, ut naufragus alicujus tabulæ fidem.'—Tert., *De Pœnitentia*, i.; Migne, *P. L.* i. col. 1233.

[2] S. John xx. 22, 23.

CHAPTER XI

ARTICLE XI

The resurrection of the body (flesh).—*Apostles' Creed.*

And I look for the resurrection of the dead.—*Nicene Creed.*

At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies.—*Athanasian Creed.*

Of the Resurrection of the Body.

Under this Article we have first to notice the difference in the three Creeds: the Apostles' professing a resurrection of the flesh (carnis); for though our present translation has 'body,' the Latin is 'carnis,' the Greek (of Marcellus of Ancyra) 'σαρκός,' and the English Creeds before 1543 had the more accurate rendering 'flesh.' The Nicene Creed has always had 'the resurrection of the *dead*' (τῶν νεκρῶν), and the Athanasian *body* (cum corporibus suis).

I. If we turn to S. Paul's great treatise on the resurrection, we shall find, in the very passage in which he refutes the view that the body with which we rise will be *materially* identical with our present bodies, that he uses all three terms flesh, body, and dead, as practically synonymous.[1]

We know that even in S. Paul's time there were those who, professing to believe in the resurrection, either limited it to the soul—a view held by most of the heathen who believed in some sort of immortality—or explained it of a spiritual resurrection at the time

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 39, 40, 42.

of conversion from heathenism to Christianity, like Hymenæus and Philetus, 'who concerning the truth (have) erred, saying that the resurrection is past already.'[1]

We find also in the second century that the Gnostics[2] accepted a resurrection, but not the resurrection of the *body*. This too was the teaching of the Manicheans and of Marcion.[3] And it was doubtless the necessity of combating these and similar heresies which led many of the early Fathers of the Church to substitute for the scriptural phrase 'resurrection of the dead' that which passed into the Apostles' Creed, 'resurrection of the flesh'; and not only to use this phrase, but often to interpret it in a very materialistic sense, *e.g.* Tertullian,[4] S. Jerome,[5] Rufinus,[6] S. Augustine,[7] the only one who protested against this being Origen.[8] He complains that not only among heretics, but even among the orthodox, was the opinion prevalent that the very same bones and flesh and blood would be raised in order that the body of each at the resurrection might be precisely identical with the body possessed in this life.

That the resurrection body will be identical with the body we now possess is indeed the doctrine of

[1] 2 Tim. ii. 18.

[2] S. Iren. v. 9; Migne, *P. G.* vii. col. 1144; Tertullian, *De carne Christi*, 48; Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 863-865.

[3] Tertull., *Contra Marcion*, v. 9-10; Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 491-497.

[4] Tertull., *De res. Carnis*, 63; Migne, *P. L.* ii. col. 885.

[5] Hieron., *Contra Joan. Hierosol.*; Migne, *P. L.* xxiii. 375.

[6] Rufin., *De Symb.* 42; Migne, *P. L.* xxi. col. 379.

[7] S. Aug., *De Civit.* xxii. 20 and 21; Migne, *P. L.* xli. col. 782, 783; *Retract.* i. 17; Migne, *P. L.* xxxii. col. 613. S. Augustine in his earlier work, *De fide et Symbolo*, xxiv., takes a less materialistic view. 'Illo tempore immutationis angelicæ non jam caro erit et sanguis sed tantum corpus . . . in cælestibus . . . nulla caro sed *corpora* simplicia et lucida quæ adpellat Apostolus *Spiritualia*.' Migne, *P. L.* xl. col. 195.

[8] Origen, quoted in S. Hieron. *Contra Joan. Hierosol.* 25; Migne, *P. L.* xxiii. col. 375.

the Church, but its conditions will be so different that it behoves us to consider what we mean by our body—or rather, as that would be a most difficult question to answer, what we do not mean by it, and to distinguish between what is essential in our body and what is only accidental. Now it seems evident that the material molecules which compose our flesh and blood and bones, and which can be analysed and resolved into their chemical constituents, cannot be a permanent part of the body, since they are in this life in a constant state of flux, and are only the food which we have assimilated by the processes of digestion.

The molecules, which form the various tissues of which the body is composed, change almost entirely every few years; so that there is no material identity of tissue between the body of a man at the age of twenty and his body forty years later. And yet there is in him a real identity of body, in the sense that he has but one body, and that through all its changes of tissue it remains the same body. The body then is not the chemical constituents of which its tissues are composed, but an organism which has the power of taking into itself, by the processes of digestion, certain material elements needed to build up its tissue, and to supply its waste, in order that it may fulfil its functions in this life. In another life, wherein the conditions are different, we can quite conceive that the organism may supply its needs in an entirely different manner.

We have but one example of a resurrection body—that of our Lord's—since the bodies of others who, like Lazarus, were raised from the dead returned to the same conditions of life, and did not possess 'glorified' bodies. But in our Lord's case His appearances were evidently adapted to the needs of those to whom He manifested Himself, as when 'while they yet believed not . . . He took and did eat before them';[1] and

[1] S. Luke xxiv. 41, 43.

when, to overcome the doubts of S. Thomas, He said 'Reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side: and be not faithless, but believing.'[1] It would therefore not be safe to draw from them inferences concerning the resurrection body; since we have reason to believe that the function of eating will be unnecessary in heaven,[2] and that the injuries sustained in this life will have no effect on the glorified body. Two properties, however, which do not seem to come under this category, we may notice in our Lord's risen body: That it was independent of the laws of matter; for He rose from the tomb before the stone was rolled away, and became present in the room where the disciples were assembled on Easter Day, the doors being shut for fear of the Jews; and again, that it was only recognisable at the will of our Lord; for Mary Magdalene in the garden did not *at first* recognise Him, nor did the two disciples who walked with Him to Emmaus, nor did S. Peter and S. John when they first saw our Lord standing upon the shore of the lake and heard His voice.

II. Our principal source of knowledge in regard to the resurrection of the dead is S. Paul's treatise on this subject in 1 Corinthians xv. We shall find there not indeed all that would satisfy our curiosity, but enough to quicken our faith, and to enable us to meet some of the objections which are commonly brought against it.

i. The whole chapter is devoted to the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and falls into two great divisions. The first deals with the *fact* of the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, the fact upon which Christianity stands or falls; the second treats of the *mode* of the resurrection of the dead.

The first division, which consists of thirty-four verses, seems to fall into four subdivisions.

[1] S. John xx. 27. [2] Rev. vii. 16.

(1) The evidence for the *fact* of Christ's resurrection, verses 1-11.

(2) The argument from this for the resurrection of the dead, verses 12-19.

(3) Certain doctrinal inferences from Christ's resurrection, verses 20-28.

(4) Certain moral consequences which flow from a belief in the resurrection of the dead, verses 29-34.

The second division, with which we are especially concerned, contains twenty-four verses and carries us to the end of the chapter. It may be divided into three parts:

(1) The first deals with two questions in regard to the mode of the resurrection, viz.: How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come, verses 35-49.

(2) Then S. Paul considers the case of those who do not pass through death, verses 50-53.

(3) And lastly, he gives a magnificent description of our final triumph over death.

ii. If we now examine more closely the first part of the second division, which contains S. Paul's treatment of the two questions, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? we shall find there practically all the light which Revelation throws upon this mysterious subject.

The questions are not answered directly, but by analogy. We are referred to the common, everyday fact, with which all are familiar, of the growth of a grain of wheat, or of any other seed; and our attention is especially directed to certain points, which by analogy suggest an answer to the two questions. In regard to the first, 'How are the dead raised up?' it is shown that in the case of a seed the condition of its return to life is its *death*, that is, the dissolution of its material wrappings—'That which thou thyself sowest is not quickened except it die.' It is by the process of

dissolution that the germ of life, which the seed contains, is set free and asserts itself. This germ of life shows itself by two shoots in opposite directions, one beneath the ground, the root; the other, the stem, above it. But the *tissue* of which these are formed is not contained in the seed, but is derived from properties in the soil and the air, which the *organism* contained in the seed has the power of assimilating in order to build up its new tissue, and so to grow according to the law of its own nature.

Here we may observe that S. Paul avoids two common mistakes: (1) that of identifying the risen body with the present body, *as if they contained the same material molecules*; (2) and that of destroying all connection between the two—as if the risen body were altogether a new creation without organic relation to the earthly body.

Our Lord uses the same figure of His own death and resurrection when He says, 'Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.'[1]

Hence we may say that the answer which S. Paul gives to the first question, 'How are the dead raised up?' is simply—through the action of death itself in dissolving the molecular constituents, and setting free the organism for a new effort of life.

This, he seems to say, is what we see in the ordinary processes of the growth of a grain of wheat, and this affords some analogy to what we may suppose will take place in the resurrection of the dead. We must be careful to observe that nothing more than an analogy is suggested, and that nothing more definite is asserted.

In regard to the second question, 'With what body do they come?' S. Paul works out the analogy more in detail.

[1] S. John xii. 24.

He begins by pointing out that in the case of the seed, 'that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain.'[1] The word bare (*γυμνόν*) calls attention to the greatness of the contrast between what is sown, and what is produced from the seed,—between the bare naked seed, stripped of all covering, stripped of its leaves, calyx, corolla, etc., and what springs from it after it has passed through death, and its molecular constituents have been dissolved by it.

Here he does no more than show that the analogy suggests a resurrection body far more glorious than that which is committed to the earth.

In his next statement S. Paul adds to the analogy *the assertion* 'that God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him, and to every (each) seed its own body.'[2]

S. Paul does not say that God *shall* give to each a body as it *shall* please Him in the future, but that the body God gives at the resurrection is the body which was determined upon (*ἠθέλησεν*) when God created man, and that to each is assigned a body of its own (*ἴδιον σῶμα*). Hence that body would seem to be the development of the organism under the different conditions of the resurrection life, but according to the laws which God Himself originally imposed upon it. Here the organism (the body) had the power of supplying its needs of life and growth, under the conditions of this world, by assimilation of certain molecular constituents by processes of digestion; very different are the conditions of the life there, where 'they shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more,'[3] and where 'they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God'[4]—that is apparently where the functions of eating and drinking and of reproduction find no place. In that life the body may have power

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 37.
[2] 1 Cor. xv. 38.
[3] Rev. vii. 16.
[4] S. Matt. xxii. 30

to appropriate what it needs for its perfect life, yet that life may not require the assimilation of material molecules. In other words, there may be in the life beyond an identity of the organism (the body) without an identity of molecular tissue.

S. Paul then passes on to show that both in celestial and terrestrial bodies there is such a difference as to insure each body its own individual properties. As he observes, the flesh of men and the flesh of beasts is of a different genus, and is quite distinguishable from all others, so that each here has a body of his own. So, he says, shall it be in the resurrection of the dead: each shall retain his own corporeal individuality and identity in the body which God assigned to him.

ii. Then S. Paul, dropping the analogy, states four positive propositions concerning the character of the resurrection body which form the basis of all theological treatment of the subject. The propositions are that the body—

1. Is sown in corruption; is raised in incorruption.
2. Is sown in dishonour; is raised in glory.
3. Is sown in weakness; is raised in power.
4. Is sown a natural (*i.e.* psychical—ψυχικόν) body; is raised a spiritual (πνευματικόν) body.

From these four propositions we derive the four properties of the resurrection or glorified body, viz. Impassibility, Clarity (or brightness), Agility, and Subtlety. Let us consider each a little more in detail.

We shall understand these properties better if we consider the body as the instrument of the soul by which it is *informed*. In this life the body, wonderful as it is in its construction, is but an imperfect instrument, in that it often impedes the soul in its action, and, instead of being its obedient servant, becomes its tyrannical master by the assertion of inordinate

appetites. In the life of heaven after the resurrection the body will be in all respects the perfect instrument of the soul, whose every behest it will promptly obey, since it will become possessed of the properties of Impassibility, Clarity, Agility, and Subtlety, which it will receive from the soul itself.

1. For impassibility, which means not only freedom from death but from all pain and suffering, S. Thomas Aquinas considers arises from the perfect subjection of the body to the rational soul, by virtue of which the soul communicates its own impassibility to the body.[1]

2. Clarity or brightness is that property of the glorified body which causes it to shine with the glory and beauty of heaven, of which the Apostles had a glimpse when our Lord was transfigured; for 'His Face did shine as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light.'[2]

To this property of the risen body S. Paul refers in the words, 'It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory.' And in the parable of the Tares our Lord expressly foretells this when He says, 'Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.'[3]

This brightness will be caused, as S. Thomas teaches, by the overflow of the glory of the soul upon the body.[4]

3. Agility is that endowment by which the risen body is able to transfer itself from place to place with the swiftness of thought at the will of the soul, which property S. Paul implies when he says 'it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power.' In this life our movements are regulated and limited by the mobility of our bodies; in heaven they will be controlled by the

[1] S. Thomas Aquin., *Summa*: supp. quæst. lxxxii. *a.* 1; ed. Migne, tom. iv. col. 1312.
[2] S. Matt. xvii. 2. [3] S. Matt. xiii. 43.
[4] S. Thomas, *Summa*: supp. quæst. lxxxv. *a.* 1; Migne, col. 1335.

mobility of the soul. S. Thomas puts it thus: 'The soul is not only joined to the body as its *form*, but as its *motor*, and in both cases it befits the glorified body to be entirely subject to the glorified soul, so that it may be apt and obedient to all the motions and actions of the soul.'[1]

4. Subtlety, which is that quality in the risen body which enables it to penetrate other bodies without injury either to themselves or to those bodies through which they pass, is exemplified by our Lord's risen body on Easter Day, in rising from the tomb before the stone was rolled away, and in becoming present to the disciples in the chamber with the doors closed. This attribute does not arise from absence of dimension or extension in the glorified body, but rather from the fact that these properties are so suspended that it is able to penetrate other bodies. S. Thomas holds that this quality arises from the dominion of the glorified soul which 'informs' the body when the body is called spiritual, since it is altogether subject to the spirit.[2]

5. When S. Paul says of the body that 'it is sown a *natural* body; it is raised a *spiritual* body,' he uses terms (ψυχικός and πνευματικός) which seem to imply that the body in this life is psychical, in that it is dominated by the influences of the animal or lower soul; for S. Paul, when he contrasts soul with spirit (ψυχή with πνεῦμα), as he does in the passage 'May your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,'[3] is not using a division all the members of which are co-ordinate, since such a division could have but two members, soul and body (the spiritual and material parts of man as he now is); but in the one he employs the first two members, 'spirit' and 'soul,' fall under

[1] S. Thomas, *Summa*: supp. quæst. lxxxiv. *a.* 1; Migne, col. 1328.
[2] *Ibid.* quæst. lxxxiii. *a.*1; Migne, col. 1319.
[3] 1 Thess. v. 23.

the general member 'soul' of our second division (into soul and body). Hence in this passage S. Paul regards the 'spirit' as the higher part of the human soul—the rational soul; and 'soul' as the lower part or animal soul—animal not in the sense in which we ordinarily use the word, but as animating the body.

The term ψυχικός occurs in two other passages in the New Testament, in S. James iii. 15 and S. Jude 19, both of which are rendered in our version by the word 'sensual,' *i.e.* under the domination of the senses, which suggests the same idea, the domination of the animal part in the human soul as distinguished from the rational part.

A holy man is one whose rational soul or spirit, corresponding with the influences of the Holy Spirit, is able to keep more or less in subjection the impulses of the mere animal soul; a *sensual* man is one of whom the opposite may be said, as the passage in S. Jude implies: 'These be they who separate themselves (make separations), *sensual*, having not the Spirit.'

In the glorified body after the resurrection the rational soul freed from every evil influence will absolutely dominate the body, which will be its perfect and willing instrument, and hence is spoken of by S. Paul as 'spiritual' in that it is entirely subject to the spiritual part of man.

So that all the endowments of the risen body are the result of its perfect subordination to the glorified soul, whose properties it therefore shares.

The resurrection of the body is not merely a doctrine of theological interest, it should have great moral consequences in our lives now. For the capacity of the *body*, for beatitude after the resurrection and in eternity, depends upon the discipline of the body now.

The injuries which the body receives through accident or disease in this life will leave no mark upon

the glorified body, but sin has effects which last beyond the grave. The indulgence in unrestrained passion or unconquered sloth may have the effect of limiting the capacity of the body, as well as of the soul, for the full enjoyment of the glories of eternity.

CHAPTER XII

ARTICLE XII

And the life everlasting.—*Apostles' Creed.*

And the life of the world to come.—*Nicene Creed.*

And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting: and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.—*Athanasian Creed.*

Of the Life Everlasting.

Each of the three Creeds ends with a profession of faith in an eternal life after the general resurrection, the Athanasian Creed stating explicitly, what the others imply, the twofold character of that life according as we are among the lost or the saved.

This is the undoubted teaching of Holy Scripture, for in the last parable our Lord spoke we read, 'And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal';[1] and the everlasting punishment is described, in a previous verse of the parable, as 'everlasting fire':—'Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire.'[2] It is most solemnly suggestive that the very last words of our Lord's *public* teaching should have been: 'These shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal,'—a glorious promise, but a solemn and awful warning.

There are some who 'catch at the straw' of evasion of the plain meaning of our Lord's words, by claiming

[1] S. Matt. xxv. 46. [2] S. Matt. xxv. 41.

that the word translated 'everlasting' (*αἰώνιον*) does not always signify 'everlasting,' but rather means 'ages.' The answer is simple, that this word is used of the life of God Himself, 'according to the commandment of the *everlasting* God' (*τοῦ αἰωνίου Θεοῦ*),[1] and that the same word is used in the second member of this sentence: 'but the righteous into life eternal.' By every principle of interpretation the word, *ἀιώνιος*, must be taken in precisely the same sense in both clauses; so that if the life of the righteous is without end, the punishment of the lost must be of the same duration. This does not necessarily assert that there may not be mitigations, as Newman suggests; but it does require, what it says, that the state into which the lost enter shall be eternal, and shall be a state of punishment.[2]

But to turn to the glorious future in eternity of the saved, let us consider in what this 'life everlasting' consists.

I. The Collect in the Burial office teaches us to pray, 'that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our *perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul*, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory,' and it would be difficult to find a phrase in which better to express 'the life everlasting' of the saved.

The ideal of heaven set before us is the attainment of the perfect consummation of all the powers both of body and soul. Its realisation for each individual will be limited by the capacity for it developed in this life; for heaven will be the working out of our life here.

There will be beatitude of every faculty which has been rightly cultivated here according to the will of God, and according to the pattern given us in our

[1] Rom. xvi. 26; cf. also Septuagint; Gen. xxi. 33; Job xxxiii. 12; Isaiah xxvi. 4; xl. 28.

[2] For further treatment of this subject, cf. p. 203.

Lord's life on earth—beatitude, that is, both of body and soul. The properties of the glorified body we have treated in the previous Article; it remains, therefore, only for us to consider the characteristics of the life of the soul in eternity.

The two great powers of the soul, to which all the other powers are subsidiary, are the Intellect and the Will; for the two supreme passions of human nature are to know and to love. And the perfect satisfaction of these two passions will be heaven; for it will leave nothing to be desired.

This does not mean that the power to know God and to love God will be the same in all—that will depend upon the capacity of each, and the capacity upon the development reached in this life; but the satisfaction will be perfect in each, for it will be according to the full measure of the capacity of each soul. The vessels will not all be of equal capacity, but every vessel will be filled to the brim.

Since all the powers of our nature find their highest expression in an act of the Intellect or of the Will, it will be sufficient for our purpose in treating of the life everlasting in heaven, if we consider the perfect development of these two powers in eternity.

But first it is necessary to examine the significance of the word 'perfection,' as we use it of the service of God, both in this life and the life to come.

What is perfection in a creature, in man? Is it the attainment of a certain measure or standard—the same in all? If not this, what then does it signify?

It is evident that the only absolute perfection is God's perfection, and that in a creature perfection must ever be relative, and will be the full attainment of its Creator's purpose for it. In other words, perfection in us is not quantitative, but qualitative; it is not the amount of virtues we have developed, but the sole quality of having fulfilled God's purpose for us.

That the perfection of a creature is the fulfilment of its Maker's purpose may be illustrated from the creatures of our own hands. If we take the most intricate and complicated piece of machinery and compare it with the most simple, we shall see that perfection consists not in the size or intricacy of the machine, but in its realising and fulfilling the purpose for which it was made. For instance, compare the engines of a great steamship with a common needle. The one displays the marvellous ingenuity of its maker in adapting all its varied parts to the one purpose of propelling the ship through the ocean at a certain rate of speed per hour. It easily gets out of order, and frequently fails to attain the speed the maker expected. The other is perhaps the simplest of all machines—a tiny bar of steel, sharpened at one end and pierced at the other, but the fact that it remains substantially the same to-day as a hundred years ago, is the best witness that it perfectly fulfils the purpose for which it was made. Hence the perfection of the needle is at least as great, and perhaps superior, to that of the engines of the steamship, for it seems to have reached its *completion*, while the constant improvements to engines seem to imply that they have not reached theirs.

And this corresponds well with the signification of the various forms of the Greek word τελειότης, which we translate by 'perfection.' It comes from τέλος, which we often render by our word 'end,' but which does not mean (in good Greek) the cessation of a thing, but its completion. Hence the word, as it stands in such passages as 'Ye therefore shall be *perfect*, as your heavenly Father is perfect'[1]; 'And above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfection,'[2] clearly means the attainment of the end for which we were created; for we cannot be perfect

[1] S. Matt. v. 48. [2] Col. iii. 14.

as our heavenly Father is perfect in any other sense, and the attainment of this end is charity, which is therefore called the bond of perfectness.

S. Paul, however, distinctly makes this perfection to consist in attainment to the 'measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ,'[1] in conformity to His image,[2] but our blessed Lord reveals to us the perfection of His own life in such words as 'My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me,' and 'I seek not Mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent Me,'[3] so that we are to attain to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ by the fulfilment of God's purpose for us, and in this we reach our perfection.

This perfection in its fulness belongs to the life to come, for we can neither know perfectly, nor love perfectly, till in the Beatific Vision we see God face to face. Of the imperfection of our knowledge here S. Paul reminds us when he writes, 'For now we see in a mirror, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I fully know even as also I have been fully known,' and two verses before he says, 'For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is *perfect* is come, that which is in part shall be done away.'[4]

And in regard to love, it is evident there must be an increase in the perfectness of our love when it is no longer marred by sin, and when we see face to face the object of our love, 'the King in His beauty,' and 'the land that is very far off.'[5]

And yet Holy Scripture tells us of 'perfect love'[6] even in this life, and speaks of men as 'perfect' while still in the flesh.[7] From this it has been inferred that there are two degrees of perfection: the one proper to

[1] Eph. iv. 13.
[2] Rom. viii. 29.
[3] S. John iv. 34, 35.
[4] 1 Cor. xiii. 12 and ix. 10.
[5] Isa. xxxiii. 17.
[6] S. John iv. 17, 18.
[7] 1 Cor. ii. 6; Phil. iii. 15; Col. iv. 12; S. Jam. iii. 2.

our life in this world, the other to our life in heaven. They are called in ascetic theology Perfection 'in via' and 'in patria,' and they are related as the 'means' is to the 'end.' The man is spoken of as perfect here who, like S. Paul, 'forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, presses on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.'[1] Such an one, using all the helps and means of grace within his reach, becomes perfect 'in via'; for he fulfils the purposes of God for him *at that time*. But 'in patria,' having attained to the end for which he was created, he reaches a different and higher degree of perfection, and this abides.

II. From the consideration of the sense in which we use the term 'perfection' of creatures, we must turn back to an investigation of that perfection of the Intellect and Will, in which consists the beatitude of the soul in 'life everlasting.'

Beatitude has been defined by S. Thomas as 'a perfect good which entirely satisfies our desires,' and he proceeds to show that men cannot find 'beatitude' in created things, but only in the uncreated Good—that is, in the possession of God.[2]

For God, and God alone, is at once the first Principle from which we receive our being and all other good things, and the final End to which our intellectual powers, rightly used, ceaselessly tend. But created good things, since they are finite and transitory, can never satisfy the desires of an immortal soul; as S. Augustine well expresses it: 'Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our heart is restless, until it rests in Thee.'[3]

[1] Cf. Phil. iii. 13, 14.

[2] S. Thomas, *Summa*, 1ª. 2æ quæst. ii. *a.* 8; ed. Migne, tom. ii. col. 31.

[3] S. Aug. *Confess.*; Migne, *P. L.* xxxii. col. 661.

The beatitude of heaven, which is also spoken of as the glory of heaven, may be considered as twofold: the glory of the soul and the glory of the body. Of the latter we treated in the last Article.

The beatitude or glory of the soul in heaven consists essentially in its vital union with God, and this union is thought to be *perfected* by a twofold act,—by the Beatific Vision in which the Intellect immediately sees God, and by a beatified Love with which the Will loves Him. By these two acts the Blessed possess and enjoy God.[1]

i. The Beatific Vision has been defined as a distinct and intuitive, but nevertheless *not comprehensive*, knowledge of God as He is in Himself.

It is distinct or clear, as differing from a knowledge of God, acquired either by reason or by faith, since such knowledge has always a certain obscurity.[2] It is intuitive or immediate in the sense that God is seen in Himself directly, and not through the medium of creatures. Thus the Beatific Vision is distinguished from abstract or deductive knowledge; for in these God is apprehended by effects, whilst in the Beatific Vision we see God directly and in Himself as really present to the intellect.

We are not, however, able to see God, even in the Beatific Vision, *comprehensively*, since a finite intellect cannot perfectly comprehend God, who is infinite.

It is, of course, with the eyes of the soul, not with bodily eyes, that God is seen. This follows from the fact that God is incorporeal. Nor can any created intellect in its own natural strength enjoy the Beatific Vision, for there is no proportion between the Divine Nature and the highest created intelligence.

There must therefore be a transformation or elevation

[1] This treatment of the beatitude of the soul is taken from the author's *Catholic Faith and Practice*, Part II. pp. 442-448.

[2] Cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

of the natural powers of the soul to enable it to apprehend the Beatific Vision. For as the natural eye requires two things to enable it to see—the presence of an object, and light in order that the image of the object may be received; so the intellect in order to see God requires not only the proximity of the Divine Essence, but also an interior gift by which it is elevated to an act above its natural powers.

This quality in the intellect of the Blessed, theologians call 'the light of glory,' a term which is used frequently in the Fathers, and which was adopted by the Council of Vienne.[1]

The light of glory bestows three gifts upon the intellect of the Blessed.

(i) It raises it to a *mode* of apprehension altogether Divine; so that they are able to know God directly and immediately, as He knows Himself.

(ii) It increases the *capacity* of the intellect, so that it may be capable of immeasurable and unlimited good.

(iii) It determines and *assists* the intellect in its apprehension of the Beatific Vision, as light enables the eye to produce, not the object which it sees, but the Vision of it.

While the Saints in heaven *all* intuitively behold God face to face, they do not all apprehend Him in an equal degree.

The first part of this proposition requires no proof, since we are told again and again in Holy Scripture that we shall see God face to face, and shall know even as we are known.

That we shall not, however, all behold God in the same degree, S. Paul implies when, speaking of the state of the Blessed after the Resurrection, he says, 'One star differeth from another star in glory. So also

[1] Labbé et Cossart. Conc., tom. xv. col. 43.

is the resurrection of the dead.'[1] And our Lord said, 'In My Father's house are many mansions.'[2] Besides, Holy Scripture in many places declares that God will render to each one according to his works,[3] and that 'he which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully.'[4]

This inequality follows from the difference of capacity in the soul, which depends partly upon the talents which God bestowed upon it in creating it, but still more upon the fidelity with which those talents have been developed.

Their inequality, however, will be no cause of envy among the elect, since each one will enjoy the Beatific Vision to his full capacity, and this for him will leave nothing more to be desired.

Two objects are seen in the Beatific Vision: The first is God Himself, as seen in Himself; the second is the creatures, which are known in God. The first object constitutes the essential, the latter the accidental, beatitude of the Saints.

In the Beatific Vision we see God Himself: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; Truth, Justice, Love, etc.

The Blessed see, besides God, many other things, past, present, and future, and especially those which belong to their condition. In regard to this, theologians have taught that the knowledge of each of the blessed will be threefold :—

(1) *As elevated to the order of grace*, they will understand in a more perfect manner the mysteries in which they believed when they were upon earth; they will know the other Saints and their fellow-citizens in

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 41. [2] S. John xiv. 2.
[3] Cf. Prov. xxiv. 12; S. Matt. xvi. 27; 1 Cor. iii. 8.
[4] 2 Cor. ix. 6.

heaven, and especially those whom they knew and loved on earth with a supernatural affection.

(2) *As part of the universe*, they will know all the laws of nature; and it is thought by some, that those who in their work for God gave themselves to the study of any particular science, will probably have special joy in penetrating the principles of that science.

(3) *As individuals*, holding public or private office, each will know all things which appertain to his former state. A Bishop, for instance, will see especially all that pertains to the government of the Church. A mother will perceive those things which relate to her children. Those persons and matters in which they were interested, when they were on earth, will remain special objects of care to the Saints in heaven, and they will pray for them. This last, of course, is only before the Day of Judgment.

ii. From the intuitive knowledge of God in the Beatific Vision flows a perfect and beatified love, so that the Saints love God fully and perfectly; for S. Paul says: 'Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.'[1] The WILL is infallibly attracted to the highest Good. In the Beatific Vision the *intellect* recognises God as the highest Good, therefore the *will* reaches out to God with most burning and perfect love.

As the light of glory is bestowed upon the Saints in heaven to perfect the intellect and to enable it to know God absolutely, so in the Blessed the will is strengthened by the habit of charity, which enables it to love God perfectly as the Supreme Good.

Theologians teach that the effect of this beatific

[1] 1 Cor. xiii. 8.

Love may be regarded as twofold: ecstasy and union with God.

Ecstasy may be described as the state in which a man, so to speak, passes out of himself into the possession of the object of his love. Thus the Saints are so drawn to God in thought and affection that all thoughts and motives of self-love become entirely extinguished in them, and they are, as it were, dead to self and alive only to God; seeking nothing but His glory, as S. Paul says: 'I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.'[1] The other effect of beatific Love is perfect union with God. By this union the Saints are joined so closely to God through the sublime and perpetual contemplation of the Divine Essence (since they always behold the Face of God), and by continual imitation of the Divine Character, and perfect conformity with the Divine Will, that they are in a sense transformed into the likeness of God. Thus the Saints are so consumed with the love of God that they all seem to be absorbed and immersed in the abyss of Divinity, and yet without loss of individuality, for they always remain distinct from Him.

Thus, in the beatification of the Intellect and Will, the two supreme passions of man's nature—to know and to love—find their perfect satisfaction in the life everlasting.[2]

iii. So far we have treated only of the positive joys of heaven, but revelation reminds us that there are negative joys also; that there shall be no more sorrow

[1] Gal. ii. 20.

[2] This is the view of a large school, of whom Lessius and Suarez, following S. Bonaventura, were the leaders. There are, however, two other opinions: that of the Scotists, who hold that formal Beatitude consists essentially in the beatific Love; and that of the Thomists, who teach that it consists in the Beatific vision alone; so that Love, although proceeding from the vision and pertaining to the state of happiness, yet does not pertain to its essence.

and suffering, no more doubts and fears, no more sin, no more death; for 'God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.'[1]

Then, too, in heaven, as we have said, there will be no loss of our individuality. We shall not be merely swallowed up in one great ocean of goodness in which all personality will be lost, but we shall each drink in the joys of that Vision and shall be individually satisfied with it.

iv. And lastly, heaven is eternal—that life will be everlasting. In this life, to spoil every joy, is the certainty that it will not last. Here is ceaseless change; but 'of His kingdom there shall be no end.'[2]

Eternity is not an infinite succession of years, but that which exists necessarily and has no beginning, no end, and no change. Eternity is distinguished from immutability too, in that immutability is only the negation of change, while eternity expresses something more, duration and perseverance in being together with the negation of measure. As S. Thomas (adopting the definition of Boethius) says, 'Eternity is a simultaneously full and perfect possession of interminable life.'[3] Eternity, therefore, is to time what immensity is to space. Both belong to God necessarily, because He is infinite and Self-existing, and to the Saints in heaven by virtue of their union with God.

The Beatific Vision and the Beatific Love of God are to the Saints an endless source of unspeakable joy and supreme happiness. As the Psalmist tells us: 'They shall be satisfied with the plenteousness of Thy house;

[1] Rev. xxi. 4. [2] S. Luke i. 33.

[3] S. Thomas, *Summa*, Pars. I. quæst. x. *a.* 1; ed. Migne, tom. i. col. 521.

and Thou shalt give them drink of Thy pleasures, as out of the river. For with Thee is the well of life; and in Thy light shall they see light.'[1] And again, 'As for me, I will behold Thy presence in righteousness: and when I awake up after Thy likeness, I shall be satisfied with it.'[2]

[1] Ps. xxxvi. 8, 9. [2] Ps. xvii. 15.

LAUS DEO

PART III

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

In this Appendix will be found, arranged chronologically, all the important Creed-forms quoted or referred to in our treatment of the Apostles' Creed, together with a note of the date and source of each.

For convenience of reference we have given the section and page in Hahn's *Bibliothek der Symbole* (3rd edition) on which each Creed may be found, and also, where the Creed finds a place in Heurtley's *Harmonia Symbolica*, we have noted the page.

In some few cases a different reading from Hahn's has been followed.

S. Irenæus, Church of Southern Gaul (*c.* 180), *Contr. Hæres.* lib. i. cap. ix et x.

Contr. Haeres. lib. i. cap. ix. 4.—Οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκλινῆ ἐν ἑαυτῷ κατέχων, ὃν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἴληφε . . . cap. x. 1. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐκκλησία, καίπερ καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἕως περάτων τῆς γῆς διεσπαρμένη, παρὰ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἐκείνων μαθητῶν παραλαβοῦσα τὴν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν πεποιηκότα τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, πίστιν. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν σαρκωθέντα ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας. Καὶ εἰς Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, τὸ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κεκηρυχὸς τὰς οἰκονομίας καὶ τὰς ἐλεύσεις, καὶ τὴν ἐκ παρθένου γέννησιν, καὶ τὸ πάθος, καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ τὴν ἔνσαρκον εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν τοῦ ἠγαπημένου Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα καὶ ἀναστῆσαι πᾶσαν σάρκα πάσης ἀνθρωπότητος, ἵνα Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν καὶ θεῷ καὶ σωτῆρι καὶ βασιλεῖ κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἀοράτου πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων, καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσηται αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν δικαίαν ἐν τοῖς πᾶσι ποιήσηται· τὰ μὲν πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας καὶ ἀγγέλους [τοὺς] παραβεβηκότας καὶ ἐν ἀποστασίᾳ γεγονότας καὶ τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἀδίκους καὶ ἀνόμους καὶ βλασφήμους τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ πέμψῃ· τοῖς δὲ δικαίοις καὶ ὁσίοις καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τετηρηκόσι καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ αὐτοῦ διαμεμενηκόσι, τοῖς [μὲν] ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, τοῖς δὲ ἐκ μετανοίας, ζωὴν χαρισάμενος ἀφθαρσίαν δωρήσηται καὶ δόξαν αἰωνίαν περιποιήσῃ.—§ v. Hahn, pp. 6, 7, Heurtley, pp. 7, 8, 9.

S. Irenæus, *Contr. Hæres.* lib. iii. cap. iv. 1, 2.

Quid autem si neque Apostoli quidem Scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant Ecclesias? Cui ordinationi assentiunt multæ gentes barbarorum, eorum qui in Christum credunt sine charta et atramento scriptam habentes per Spiritum in cordibus suis salutem, et ueterem traditionem diligenter custodientes, In unum Deum credentes, Fabricatorem [factorem, Hahn] cœli et terræ, et omnium quæ in eis sunt, per Christum Iesum Dei Filium; Qui propter eminentissimam erga figmentum suum dilectionem, eam quæ esset ex Uirgine generationem sustinuit, ipse per se hominem adunans Deo: Et passus sub Pontio Pilato, Et resurgens, Et in claritate receptus, In gloria uenturus, Salvator eorum qui saluantur et Iudex eorum qui iudicantur; et mittens in ignem æternum transfiguratores ueritatis et contemptores Patris sui et aduentus eius.—Hahn, p. 7; Heurtley, p. 11.

Tertullian, Church of Carthage (*c.* 203), *De Præscript. Hæret.* cap. xiii.

Regula est autem fidei, . . . illa scilicet qua creditur, Unum omnino Deum esse, nec alium præter mundi conditorem, qui uniuersa de nihilo produxerit. Per Uerbum suum primo omnium demissum Id Uerbum Filium eius appellatum in nomine Dei uarie uisum a patriarchis, in prophetis semper auditum, Postremo delatum ex Spiritu Patris Dei et uirtute, in Uirginem Mariam. Carnem factum in utero eius, et ex ea natum, egisse Jesum Christum. Exinde prædicasse nouam legem et nouam promissionem regni cœlorum; uirtutes fecisse. Fixum cruci; Tertia die resurrexisse; In cœlos ereptum; Sedisse ad dexteram Patris; Misisse uicariam uim Spiritus sancti, qui credentes agat; Uenturum cum claritate ad sumendos sanctos in uitæ æternæ et promissorum cœlestium fructum, et ad profanos adiudicandos igni perpetuo, Facta utriusque partis resuscitatione, cum carnis restitutione.—§ ix. Hahn, p. 9; Heurtley, p. 15.

Tertullian (*c.* 210), *De Uirginibus Uelandis*, cap. i.

Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola, immobilis, et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet, in unicum Deum Omnipotentem, mundi conditorem; Et Filium eius, Iesum Christum, natum ex Uirgine Maria, Crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, Tertia

die resuscitatum a mortuis, Receptum in cœlis, Sedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris, Uenturum iudicare uiuos et mortuos, Per carnis etiam resurrectionem.—Hahn, p. 10; Heurtley, p. 16.

TERTULLIAN (*c.* 210), *Aduersus Praxeam*, cap. ii.

Nos uero et semper, et nunc magis, ut instructiores per Paracletum, Deductorem scilicet omnis ueritatis, Unicum quidem Deum credimus: Sub hac tamen dispensatione, quam œconomiam dicimus, ut unici Dei sit et Filius, Sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, Per quem omnia facta sunt, Et sine quo factum est nihil. Hunc missum a Patre in Uirginem, et ex ea natum, Hominem et Deum, Filium hominis et Filium Dei, et cognominatum Iesum Christum: Hunc passum; Hunc mortuum et sepultum, secundum Scripturas; Et resuscitatum a Patre, Et in cœlos resumptum, Sedere ad dexteram Patris: Uenturum iudicare uiuos et mortuos: Qui exinde miserit, secundum promissionem suam, a Patre, Spiritum Sanctum, Paracletum, Sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum.—Hahn, p. 10; Heurtley, p. 16.

S. CYPRIAN, CHURCH OF CARTHAGE (*c.* 255), Epist. lxxvi. *Ad Magnum.*

Quod si aliquis illud opponit ut dicat, eandem Nouatianum legem tenere, quam catholica ecclesia teneat, eodem symbolo quo et nos baptizare, eundem nosse *Deum Patrem*, eundem *Filium Christum*, eundem *Spiritum Sanctum*, . . . nam cum dicunt: *Credis in remissionem peccatorum et uitam æternam per sanctam ecclesiam?* Mentiuntur in interrogatione, quando non habeant ecclesiam.

Epist. lxx. Ad Ianuarium et cæteros episcopos Numidas. Sed et ipsa interrogatio, quæ fit in baptismo, testis est ueritatis. Nam cum dicimus: Credis in uitam æternam et remissionem peccatorum per sanctam ecclesiam? intelligimus, remissionem peccatorum non nisi in ecclesia dari, apud hæreticos autem, ubi ecclesia non sit, non posse peccata dimitti.—§ xii. Hahn, pp. 16, 17; Heurtley, p. 20.

POPE DIONYSIUS OF ROME, CHURCH OF ROME (259-269). Fragment contained in S. Athanasius' *De decretis Nicenæ Synodi*, cap. xxvi.; also in Epist. i. Dionysii *adv. Sabellianos.*

Ἀλλὰ πεπιστευκέναι χρὴ εἰς θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἡνῶσθαι δὲ τῷ θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τὸν λόγον, . . . οὕτω γὰρ ἂν καὶ θεία τριὰς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον κήρυγμα τῆς μοναρχίας διασώζοιτο.—Hahn, p. 16 (note).

Novatian (*c.* 269), *De Trinitate sancta de regula fidei.*

Regula exigit ueritatis, ut primo omnium credamus in Deum Patrem et Dominum omnipotentem, id est, rerum omnium perfectissimum Conditorem. . . .

Eadem regula ueritatis docet nos credere post Patrem etiam in Filium Dei Christum Iesum, Dominum Deum nostrum, sed Dei Filium. . . .

Sed enim ordo rationis et fidei auctoritas digestis uocibus et literis Domini admonet nos post hæc credere etiam in Spiritum Sanctum, olim ecclesiæ repromissum, sed statutis temporum opportunitatibus redditum.—§ x. Hahn, pp. 15, 16.

Creed of S. Gregory Thaumaturgus (260-270). *Ἔκθεσις πίστεως κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν Γρηγορίου ἐπισκόπου Νεοκαισαρείας.*

Εἷς Θεός, Πατὴρ λόγου ζῶντος, σοφίας ὑφεστώσης καὶ δυνάμεως, καὶ χαρακτῆρος ἀϊδίου, τέλειος τελείου γεννήτωρ, πατὴρ υἱοῦ μονογενοῦς· Εἷς κύριος, μόνος ἐκ μόνου, θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ, χαρακτὴρ καὶ εἰκὼν τῆς θεότητος, λόγος ἐνεργός, σοφία τῆς τῶν ὅλων συστάσεως περιεκτικὴ καὶ δύναμις τῆς ὅλης κτίσεως ποιητική, υἱὸς ἀληθινὸς ἀληθινοῦ πατρός, ἀόρατος ἀοράτου καὶ ἄφθαρτος ἀφθάρτου καὶ ἀθάνατος ἀθανάτου καὶ ἀΐδιος ἀϊδίου. Καὶ ἓν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἐκ θεοῦ τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἔχον καὶ δι' υἱοῦ πεφηνὸς [δηλαδὴ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις], εἰκὼν τοῦ υἱοῦ, τελείου τελεία ζωὴ ζώντων αἰτία [πηγὴ ἁγία], ἁγιότης ἁγιασμοῦ χορηγός, ἐν ᾧ φανεροῦται θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ θεὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὁ διὰ πάντων· τριὰς τελεία, δόξῃ καὶ ἀϊδιότητι καὶ βασιλείᾳ μὴ μεριζομένη μηδὲ ἀπαλλοτριουμένη. Οὔτε οὖν κτιστόν τι ἢ δοῦλον ἐν τῇ τριάδι, οὔτε ἐπείσακτον, ὡς πρότερον μὲν οὐχ ὑπάρχον, ὕστερον δὲ ἐπεισελθόν· οὔτε γὰρ ἐνέλιπέ ποτε υἱὸς πατρί, οὔτε υἱῷ πνεῦμα, ἀλλ' ἄτρεπτος καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος ἡ αὐτὴ τριὰς ἀεί.—§ clxxxv. Hahn, pp. 253, 254, 255.

Aphraates (336),[1] *Homilies of Aphraates.*

This is the faith: that we believe in God the Lord over all, Who created heaven, earth, the seas and all that therein is; Who created man after his own image, and Who gave the law to Moses and sent of His Spirit into the prophets, and Who also sent His Messenger into the world, and that we believe in

[1] This Creed is found in a Syrian volume of Homilies. The homilies themselves inform us that they were written between 336 and 345 by a man in the Persian Empire who could speak Syrian. From other sources we learn that these homilies are the work of Aphraates, Monastery Bishop of Mar Mattai, on the east bank of the Tigris near Mossul-Nineveh. The Creed is found at the end of the first homily.

the resurrection of the dead, and also believe in the mystery of Baptism.

This is the faith of the Church of God.—§ xvi. Hahn, pp. 20, 21.

Creed of Marcellus of Ancyra, Church of Rome (*c.* 341), Epiphan., *Hæres.* 52.

Πιστεύω εἰς Θεὸν παντοκράτορα· Καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν· Τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου· Τὸν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα· Καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν· Ἀναβάντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, καὶ καθήμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρός· Ὅθεν ἔρχεται κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· Ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν· Ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτίων· Σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν· Ζωὴν αἰώνιον.—§ xvii. Hahn, pp. 22, 23; Heurtley, pp. 24, 25.

S. Ambrose, Church of Milan (*c.* 367), *Expositio Symboli ad initiandos.*

Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem. Et in Iesum Christum filium eius unicum, dominum nostrum, qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Uirgine, sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad dexteram Patris, inde uenturus iudicare uiuos et mortuos. Et in Spiritum sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem.—*Caspari*, ii. 126, 127.—§ xix. Hahn, p. 24, 25 (ascribed to Rufinus).

Rufinus, Church of Aquileia (*c.* 390), *Expositio Symboli Apostolorum.*

Credo in Deo Patre omnipotente inuisibili et impassibili; Et in Christo Iesu, unico Filio eius domino nostro, qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex uirgine Maria, crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato et sepultus, descendit in inferna, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Patris, inde uenturus est iudicare uiuos et mortuos; Et in Spiritu Sancto, sanctam ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum; huius carnis resurrectionem.—§ xxxvi. Hahn, p. 42; Heurtley, p. 26.

Nicetas of Remesiana (*c.* 400), *Explanatio Symboli ad Competentes.*

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem (cœli et terræ creatorem:) Et in Filium eius Iesum Christum, natum ex

Spiritu Sancto et ex uirgine Maria, sub Pontio Pilato passum crucifixum et mortuum ; Tertia die resurrexit uiuus a mortuis, ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dexteram (Dei) Patris, inde uenturus iudicare uiuos et mortuos : Et in Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam catholicam, communionem sanctorum, in remissionem peccatorum (hujus) carnis resurrectionem et in uitam æternam. —§ xl. Hahn, p. 47.

PRISCILLIANUS, BISHOP OF AVILA, *The Spanish Church* (*c.* 385).

(Credimus) unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem, et unum Dominum Iesum Christum, natum ex Maria uirgine ex Spiritu Sancto, passum sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixum sepultum ; tertia die resurrexisse, ascendisse in cœlos, sedere ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis inde uenturum et iudicaturum de uiuis et mortuis. (Credimus) in sanctam ecclesiam, Sanctum Spiritum baptismum salutare ; (Credimus) in remissionem peccatorum ; (Credimus) in resurrectionem carnis.—§ liii. Hahn, p. 64.

VICTRICIUS, BISHOP OF ROUEN, CHURCH OF GAUL (390-409), *Liber de laude Sanctorum.*

(Confitemur Deum Patrem confitemur Deum Filium), de Maria Uirgine, passus est, crucifixus, sepultus ; tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris, inde uenturus iudicare uiuos et mortuos ; Et in Spiritu Sancto.—§ lx. Hahn, p. 70.

S. AUGUSTINUS, CHURCH OF CARTHAGE (First quarter of fifth century). Sermo ccxv., *In Redditione Symboli.*

Credimus in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, uniuersorum creatorem, regem sæculorum, immortalem et inuisibilem. Credimus et in Filium eius [unicum] Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, natum de Spiritum Sancto ex uirgine Maria ; qui crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato et sepultus est, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, adscendit ad cælos, sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris, inde uenturus est iudicare uiuos et mortuos. Credamus et in Spiritum Sanctum, remissionem peccatorum, resurrectionem carnis et uitam æternam per sanctam ecclesiam.—§ xlvii. Hahn, p. 58.

Other slightly different forms of the Creed may be found in S. Augustine's works. In his various sermons to catechumens on the tradition and rendition of the Creed, in his book *De fide et Symbolo*, in the *Enchiridion*, etc., we may find with more or less fulness the various articles of the Creed of the Church of Carthage as it existed in S. Augustine's day.

S. Petrus Chrysologus, Bishop of Ravenna, Church of Ravenna (433-458), *Sermones in Symbolo.*

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem; Et in Christum Iesum, Filium eius unicum, Dominum nostrum; Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Uirgine; Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est, et sepultus. Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis; Ascendit in cœlos; Sedet ad dexteram Patris; Inde uenturus est iudicare uiuos et mortuos; Credo in Spiritum Sanctum; Sanctam ecclesiam Catholicam; Remissionem peccatorum; Carnis resurrectionem; Uitam æternam.—§ xxxv. Hahn, p. 41; Heurtley, p. 48.

S. Maximus of Turin, Church of Turin (*c.* 450), *De expositione Symboli.*

Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem; Et in Iesum Christum Filium eius unicum, Dominum nostrum; Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Uirgine; Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est, et sepultus; Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis; Ascendit in cœlum; Sedet ad dexteram Patris: Inde uenturus est iudicare uiuos et mortuos; Et in Spiritum Sanctum; Sanctam Ecclesiam; Remissionem peccatorum; Carnis resurrectionem.—§ xxxiv. Hahn, p. 40; Heurtley, p. 50.

Faustus, Bishop of Riez, Church of Southern Gaul (*c.* 460) (reconstructed), *Libri duo de Spiritu Sancto* and various homilies.

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem; (Credo) et in Filium eius Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria uirgine, crucifixus et sepultus, tertia die resurrexit, ascendit ad cælos, sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis, inde uenturus iudicare uiuos et mortuos; Credo in Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam catholicam, sanctorum communionem, abremissa peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem, uitam æternam.—§ lxi. Hahn, p. 70.

S. Cæsarius, Archbishop of Arles, Church of Southern Gaul (503-543) (reconstructed), Sermo ccxliv., *Pseudo-Augustine.*

(Credo) in Deum Patrem omnipotentem; (Credo) et in Iesum Christum, filium eius unicum, Dominum nostrum, conceptum de Spiritu Sancto, natum ex Maria uirgine, passum sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixum mortuum et sepultum; ad inferna descendit, tertia die a mortuis resurrexisse, eum ascendisse in cælis; sedet in

dextera Patris, inde uenturus iudicare uiuos et mortuos. Credo in Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam catholicam, sanctorum communionem, remissionem peccatorum, resurrectionem carnis et uitam æternam.—§ lxii. Hahn, pp. 72, 73.

CYPRIAN, BISHOP OF TOULON, CHURCH OF SOUTHERN GAUL (*c.* 540), *Epist. ad Maximum, Episc. Genevensem.*

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem; Credo et in Iesum Christum filium eius unigenitum, Dominum nostrum, qui conceptus de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria uirgine, Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus et sepultus. Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Patris, inde venturus iudicaturus uiuos ac mortuos.—Not found in Hahn; cf. Burn, pp. 225, 226.

FACUNDUS HERMIANENSIS, AFRICAN CHURCH (547), *Epistola fidei catholicæ in defensione trium capitulorum.*

Credimus in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem; Et in unum Dominum, Iesum Christum Filium eius; Natum ex Spiritu Sancto et Maria uirgine; Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus; Tertia die surrexit a mortuis; Ascendit in cœlum; Sedet ad dexteram Patris; Unde uenturus est iudicare vivos et mortuos; 'et reliqua.'—§ li. Hahn, p. 63; Heurtley, p. 54.

S. ILDEFONSUS, BISHOP OF TOLEDO, SPANISH CHURCH (659-669), *Liber de cognitione Baptismi*, cap. 35.

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem. Et in Iesum Christum, Filium eius unicum, Deum et dominum nostrum, qui natus est de Spiritu sancto et Maria Uirgine, sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus et sepultus, descendit ad inferna, tertia die resurrexit vivus a mortuis, ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis; inde uenturus iudicare uiuos et mortuos. Credo in Sanctum Spiritum, Sanctam ecclesiam Catholicam, remissionem peccatorum, Carnis resurrectionem et uitam æternam. —§ lv. Hahn, 66.

MARTIN, ARCHBISHOP OF BRACARA (Braga), SPANISH CHURCH (*c.* 572), *De correctione rusticorum.*

Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Et in Iesu Christo, Filio ejus unico, Deo et domino nostro, qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto a Maria Uirgine, passus sub Pontio Pilato, Crucifixus et Sepultus, descendit ad inferna, tertia die resurrexit uiuus a

mortuis, ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Patris, inde venturus judicare uiuos et mortuos. Credo in sanctum Spiritum, Sanctam ecclesiam catholicam, remissionem omnium peccatorum, carnis resurrectionum et uitam œternam.—§ liv. Hahn, pp. 65, 66.

VENANTIUS FORTUNATUS, SOUTHERN GAUL (close of sixth century), *Expositio Symboli.*

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem; Et in Iesum Christum unicum Filium; Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Uirgine; Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato; Descendit ad infernum; Tertia die resurrexit; Ascendit in cœlum; Sedet ad dexteram Patris; Iudicaturus uiuos et mortuos; Credo in Sancto Spiritu; Sanctam Ecclesiam; Remissionem peccatorum; Resurrectionem carnis.—§ xxxviii. Hahn, p. 45; Heurtley, p. 55.

PIRMINIUS (or PRIMINIUS) (*c.* 750), FRENCH CHURCH. *Dicta abbatis Pirminii* (or *Priminii*) *de singulis libris canonicis scarapsus.* Mabillon, *Vetera Analecta*, pp. 65-73, Paris, 1723.

Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Creatorem cœli et terræ; Et in Iesum Christum, Filium eius unicum, Dominum nostrum; Qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Uirgine; Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, Mortuus et sepultus; Descendit ad inferna; Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis; Ascendit ad cœlos; Sedit ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis; Inde uenturus est iudicare uiuos et mortuos. Credo in Spiritum Sanctum; Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam; Sanctorum communionem; Remissionem peccatorum; Carnis resurrectionem; Uitam æternam.—§ xcii. Hahn, p. 96; Heurtley, p. 71.

ETHERIUS, BISHOP OF OSMA AND BEATUS, THE PRESBYTER, SPANISH CHURCH (785), *Etherii episcopi Uxamensis et Beati presbyteri adversus Elipandum archiepiscopum Toletanum libri duo.*

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem; Et in Iesum Christum, Filium eius unicum, Deum et Dominum nostrum; Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Uirgine; Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, et sepultus; Descendit ad inferna; Tertia die resurrexit uiuus a mortuis; Ascendit in cœlos; Sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis; Inde uenturus iudicare uiuos et mortuos. Credo in Spiritum sanctum; Sanctam ecclesiam Catholicam; Remissionem omnium peccatorum; Carnis resurrectionem; Et uitam æternam.—§ lvi. Hahn, pp. 66, 67; Heurtley, p. 73.

Creed of the Bangor Antiphonary, Irish Church (seventh century).

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, inuisibilem omnium creaturarum uisibilium et inuisibilium conditorem. Credo et in Iesum Christum, Filium eius unicum Dominum nostrum, Deum omnipotentem, conceptum de Spiritu Sancto, natum de Maria Uirgine, passum sub Pontio Pilato, qui crucifixus et sepultus, descendit ad inferos, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlis, seditque ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis, exinde uenturus iudicare uiuos ac mortuos. Credo et in Spiritum Sanctum, Deum omnipotentem, unam habentem substantiam cum Patre et Filio; sanctam esse ecclesiam catholicam, abremissa peccatorum, sanctorum communionem, carnis resurrectionem. Credo uitam post mortem et uitam æternam in gloria Christi.—§ lxxvi. Hahn, pp. 83, 84, 85.

Sacramentarium Gallicanum, *Codex Bobiensis* (seventh century).

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, creatorem cœli et terrae; Credo in Iesum Christum, Filium eius unigenitum sempiternum. Conceptum de Spiritu Sancto, natum ex Maria Uirgine; Passum sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixum, mortuum et sepultum; Descendit ad inferna; Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis; Ascendit ad cœlos; Sedit ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis; Inde uenturus iudicare uiuos et mortuos. Credo in Spiritum Sanctum; Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam; Sanctorum communionem; Remissionem peccatorum; Carnis resurrectionem; Uitam æternam.—§ lxvi. Hahn, p. 75; Heurtley, p. 68.

Sacramentarium Gallicanum, *Codex Bobiensis* (seventh century).

Petrus dixit, Credo in Deum Patrem, omnipotentem; Ioannes dixit, Credo in Iesum Christum, Filium eius unicum, Deum et Dominum nostrum; Iacobus dixit, Natum de Maria Uirgine per Spiritum Sanctum; Andreas dixit, Passum sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixum et sepultum; Philippus dixit, Descendit ad inferna; Thomas dixit, Tertia die resurrexit; Bartholomæus dixit, Ascendit in cœlos; sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis; Matthæus dixit, Inde uenturus iudicare uiuos et mortuos; Jacobus Alphæi dixit, Credo in Spiritum Sanctum; Simon Zelotes dixit, Credo in Ecclesiam sanctam; Iudas

Iacobi dixit, Per baptismum sanctum remissionem peccatorum; Matthias dixit, Carnis resurrectionem in uitam æternam.—§ lxvi. Hahn, p. 76; Heurtley, p. 67.

Creed of the Missale Gallicanum (second century), *Mabillon De Liturgia Gallicana tres libri.*

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem creatorem cœli et terræ. Credo et in Iesum Christum, Filium eius unigenitum sempiternum, qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus est de Maria Uirgine, passus est sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus; descendit ad inferna, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit Uictor ad cœlos, sedit ad dexteram Patris omnipotentis: inde uenturus iudicare uiuos et mortuos. Credo in Sanctum Spiritum, sanctam ecclesiam Catholicam, sanctorum communionem, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem, uitam æternam.—§ lxvii. Hahn, pp. 77, 78; Heurtley, pp. 69, 70.

Codex Laudianus,[1] Church unknown (eighth century). In the Bodleian Library.

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem; Et in Christo Iesu, Filium eius unicum, Dominum nostrum; Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Uirgine; Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est, et sepultus; Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis; Ascendit in cœlis; Sedet ad dextera Patris; Unde uenturus est iudicare uiuos et mortuos: Et in Spiritu Sancto; Sancta Ecclesia; Remissione peccatorum; Carnis resurrectione.—§ xx. Hahn, p. 25; Heurtley, p. 63.

Creed in the Psalter of King Athelstan (ninth century), British Museum, *Galba A.*, xviii.

Πιστεύω εἰς θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα· καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, τὸν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀναβάντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, καθήμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρός, ὅθεν ἔρχεται κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· καὶ εἰς πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἁγίαν ἐκκλησιάν, ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν.—§ xvii. Hahn, pp. 23, 24.

[1] Wetstein believes this to have been the identical copy which was used by Bede, and assigns it to the beginning of the seventh century.

Creed of the Mozarabic Liturgy (tenth century).

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, Et in Iesum Christum, Filium eius unicum, Dominum nostrum, natum de Spiritu sancto ex utero Mariæ Uirginis, Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus et sepultus, tertia die resurrexit uiuus a mortuis, ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis, inde venturus iudicaturus uiuos et mortuos. Credo in sanctum Spiritum, sanctam ecclesiam Catholicam, sanctorum Communionem, remissionem omnium peccatorum, carnis hujus resurrectionem et uitam æternam.—§ lviii. Hahn, p. 69.

APPENDIX B

In this Appendix will be found the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds with their respective bases the Creeds of Cæsarea and Jerusalem.

Creed of Eusebius of Cæsarea (325), Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* Lib. i. 8.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ἁπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς, υἱὸν μονογενῆ, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννημένον δι' οὗ καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα· τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθόντα πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἥξοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον.—§ cxxiii. Hahn, 131, 132.

Creed of the Council of Nicæa.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ—τοῦτ' ἐστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός—θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ φῶς ἐκ φωτός, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ (or ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς)· τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελ-

θόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, ἐπανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα, καὶ ἀσαστάντα τῇ τριτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀνελθόντα εἰς [τοὺς] οὐρανούς, ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα.—§ cxlii. Hahn, 160, 161.

S. Cyril of Jerusalem (*c.* 350), (re-constructed), *Catechesis* vi.-xviii.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεόν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ· τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα θεὸν ἀληθινὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο· σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐπανθρωπήσαντα, σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα, ἀναστάντα τῇ τριτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ καθίσαντα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρός, καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς ἓν ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, τὸν παράκλητον, τὸ λαλῆσαν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις. Καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.—§ cxxiv. Hahn, 132, 133, 134.

So-called Creed of the Council of Constantinople (381).

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο· τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου καὶ ἐπανθρωπήσαντα, σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ παθόντα καὶ ταφέντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρός, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ κύριον τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, εἰς μίαν, ἁγίαν, καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Ἀμήν.—§ cxliv. Hahn, pp. 162-165.

APPENDIX C

THE ATHANASIAN CREED

1. Quicunque uult saluus esse ante omnia opus est ut teneat catholicam fidem.
2. quam nisi quisque integram inuiolatamque seruauerit, absque dubio in æternam peribit.
3. Fides autem catholica hæc est, ut unum Deum in Trinitate, et Trinitatem in Unitate ueneremur;
4. neque confundentes personas neque substantiam separantes.
5. Alia est enim persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti,
6. sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti una est diuinitas, æqualis gloria, coæterna maiestas.
7. Qualis Pater talis Filius talis et Spiritus Sanctus.
8. Increatus Pater increatus Filius increatus et Spiritus Sanctus.
9. Immensus Pater immensus Filius immensus et Spiritus Sanctus.
10. Æternus Pater æternus Filius æternus et Spiritus Sanctus.
11. Et tamen non tres æterni sed unus æternus:
12. sicut non tres increati nec tres immensi, sed unus increatus et unus immensus.
13. Similiter omnipotens Pater omnipotens Filius omnipotens et Spiritus Sanctus,
14. et tamen non tres omnipotentes sed unus omnipotens.
15. ita Deus Pater Deus Filius Deus et Spiritus Sanctus,
16. et tamen non tres Dii sed unus est Deus.
17. Ita dominus Pater dominus Filius dominus et Spiritus Sanctus,
18. et tamen non tres domini sed unus est dominus.
19. Quia sicut singillatim unamquamque personam et Deum et dominum confiteri christiana ueritate compellimur; ita tres Deos aut dominos dicere catholica religione prohibemur.
20. Pater a nullo est factus nec creatus nec genitus.
21. Filius a Patre solo est, non factus nec creatus sed genitus.
22. Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus nec creatus nec genitus, sed procedens.
23. Unus ergo Pater non tres Patres, unus Filius non tres Filii, unus Spiritus Sanctus non tres Spiritus Sancti.

24. Et in hac Trinitate nihil prius aut posterius, nihil maius aut minus, sed totæ tres personæ coæternæ sibi sunt et coæquales:
25. ita ut per omnia, sicut iam supradictum est, et Trinitas in Unitate et Unitas in Trinitate ueneranda sit.
26. Qui uult ergo saluus esse ita de Trinitate sentiat.
27. Sed necessarium est ad æternam salutem, ut incarnationem quoque domini nostri Iesu Christi fideliter credat.
28. Est ergo fides recta ut credamus et confiteamur, quia dominus noster Iesus Christus, Dei Filius, Deus et homo est.
29. Deus est ex substantia Patris ante sæcula genitus, et homo est ex substantia matris in sæculo natus.
30. Perfectus Deus perfectus homo ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens.
31. Æqualis Patri secundum diuinitatem, minor Patri secundum humanitatem.
32. Qui licet Deus sit et homo non duo tamen sed unus est Christus.
33. Unus autem, non conuersione diuinitatis in carne, sed assumptione humanitatis in Deo.
34. Unus omnino non confusione substantiæ sed unitate personæ.
35. Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo, ita Deus et homo unus est Christus:
36. qui passus est pro salute nostra, descendit ad inferna, resurrexit a mortuis.
37. ascendit ad cælos, sedet ad dexteram Patris: inde uenturus iudicare uiuos et mortuos,
38. ad cuius aduentum omnes homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis et reddituri sunt de factis propriis rationem.
39. Et qui bona egerunt ibunt in uitam æternam, qui uero mala in ignem æternam.
40. Hæc est fides catholica, quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit, saluus esse non poterit.

INDEX

The following abbreviations are used:—

Abp. = Archbishop. C. = Council. S. = Saint.
Bp. = Bishop. Cr. = Creed.

Abraham's bosom, 176.
'Abremissa,' 46.
Adam's personality and nature, 143, 144.
'Ad inferna,' 12.
'Ad inferos,' 12.
Æneas of Paris, 75.
Aëtius, Archdeacon, 61, 63, 72.
Agde, Canon of, 92.
'Agility,' 271.
Agobard, Bp. of Lyons, 88.
Aix-la-Chapelle, C. of, 81.
Alesius, Alex., 58.
Alexandria, 79.
Alienation, sense of, 159.
Allatius, Leo, 99, 180.
Almighty, 33, 129.
Amalarius, 75.
Ambrose, S., 13, 19, 43, 173, 211, 252, 295.
Anastasius, 81.
Ancoratus of S. Epiphanius, 63, 69, 71, 72.
Ancyra, Cr. of, 8.
Anicetus, Pope, 24.
Anselm, S., 157.
Anthimus, 73.
Antioch, 49, 52, 74, 79.
Aphraates, 51, 294.
Apostles' Cr., early history of, 11-30;
  language of, 29;
  literature of, 3;
  one author, 50;
  whether drawn up by Apostles, xiii.
Apostolic authorship of Creeds, 12, 13.
Apostolic constitutions, 66.
Apostolicity, fourth note of Church, 232;
  depends on mission, 232;
  and succession, 232.
Aquileia, 12, 21, 37, 40, 43, 44, 47, 53, 173.
Aquis-Grani, C. of, 81.
Aquitaine, 80.
Archimandrites, 74.
Arius, 59, 67, 77.
Arles, 40, 54.
Ascension of Christ, of the, 190-199;
  consummates His work, 190;
  inaugurates the reign of blessing, 191.
Aseity, 113.
Assisi, S. Francis of, 243.
Athanasian Cr., 3, 40, 53, 81, 86, 87, 92, 93, 98, 124, 137, 173, 175, 263, 304;
  complete theory of, 97, 98;
  paralleled with S. Augustine, 94, 95;
  with S. Vincent's Commonitorium, 96.
Athanasius, S., 22, 65, 79, 92, 97, 98, 124.
Athelstan's Psalter, 3, 23, 47, 87, 301.
Atonement and Personality, by Moberly, 172, 259.
Atonement, of the, 155, 172;
  Day of, 194;
  Reformation theory of, 153, 154;
  Luther's views, 154;
  view of S. Irenæus and Origen 156, 157;
  of Ante-Nicene Fathers, 156;

Atonement of S. Barnabas and S. Ignatius, 156;
of Peter Lombard, 157;
theory of *Cur Deus Homo*, 157.
Attributes of God are his Essence, 113, 116, 117.
Augustine, S., 19, 38, 44, 46, 74, 93, 94, 95, 119, 127, 213, 250, 264;
Confessions of, 280.
Autun, Canons of, 91, 92, 98.
Avignon, 54.
Avitus, Bp. of Vienne, 93, 94.

Ballerini, 93.
Bangor Antiphonary, 46, 92, 300.
Baptism, one, 260;
conveys character, 260;
its grace, regeneration; its effect, justification, 261;
causes infusion of faith, hope, and charity, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, 261;
adult, 261;
Baptism and resurrection, 189.
Baptismal formula, 16.
Baronius, 46.
Basil, S., 71, 252.
Batiffol, 56, 98, 99.
Beatific Vision, 180, 279, 281-284.
Beatitude, 276, 277, 280, 281.
Beatus, 39, 41, 299.
'Belief,' deviation of, 104, 105.
'Believe I,' 43, 84.
Benedict Biscop, S., 56.
Benedict VIII., Pope, 76.
Benedict, S., rule of, 81, 243.
Berno, Abbot of Richenau, 76.
Beron, 151.
Bessarion, 82.
Bethlehem, 80.
Bingham's *Origenes*, 4.
Bobbio, 90.
Body, 273.
Body, meaning of, 227, 228, 236;
organs of, 237;
what it is not, 265.
Boethius, 127, 286.
Bonaventura, S., 285.
Boniface, Bp. of Carthage, 73.
'Both,' 'to judge *both* the quick' etc., 88.
Britain, 80.
Burial Office Collect, 276.
Burn, A. E., 7, 10, 25, 32, 36, 38, 52, 55, 86, 87, 91, 94, 97, 98.

Cæsarea, 59, 71.
Cæsarius of Arles, S., 41, 43, 47, 54, 55, 86, 93, 97, 297.
Calvinism and free-will, 254.
Cappadocian Cr., 66, 70.
'Carnis,' 47, 263.
Carter's *Manual of Repentance*, 208.
Carthage, 36.
Carthage, C. of, 73.
Caspari, Dr. C. P., 5, 11, 32, 38, 52, 93.
Cassian, 54.
Catacombs, witness of, 251.
Cathari, 231.
Catholic, 33, 43, 55.
Catholicity, third note of Church, used in two senses, 231;
essential and ideal, 231.
Celestine, Pope, 14.
Chalcedon, C. of, 59, 61, 63, 65, 70-74, 84, 97, 212.
Charisius of Philadelphia, 60, 71, 72.
Charismata in the Church, 241, 242.
Charlemagne, 56, 75, 79, 80, 82, 88.
Christ,
His threefold office, 133;
His Lordship essential and vicarious, 138;
His human soul, 147;
human nature, 148;
two wills, 148, 151;
three classes of actions, 148;
His knowledge of three kinds, 149;
His death includes inward dispositions of love and obedience, 164;
His two unions, hypostatic and vital, 175;
His priestly and kingly offices in heaven, 191; treated of, in Epistle to Hebrews, 192-196;
His High Priestly actions, 198.
Christian ministry, three views of, 239.
Chrodegang, S., 56.
Chrysostom, S., 196.

Church,
of the, 224-247
its teaching office, 109, 110;
derivation of, 224;
idea of, 224;
as the Kingdom of heaven, 225;
as the Body of Christ, 225;
extensively consists of all the baptized, 226;
four notes of, 226;
unity, two conceptions of, 226;
first note of, 226;
three erroneous views of, 227;
essential and ideal, 228;
now exists in three states, 229;
Holiness its second note, 229;
Catholicity its third, 231;
Apostolicity its four[illegible], 232;
four functions of, 244;
as Guardian of Truth, 244;
as Guide in Morals, 245;
as Dispenser of Grace, 247;
as Director of Worship, 247;
Catacombs, witness of, 251.
Church Quarterly Review, 83.
Clarity, 271.
Clemen, Dr. C., 8.
Clement Alex., 24, 126, 192.
Clement of Rome, S., 37, 233.
Codex Laudianus, 301.
Cœlum or Cœlos, in, or ad, 41, 42.
Coincidences of English and Toletan Creeds, 84, 85.
Commodus, 27.
'Communicatio Idiomatum,' 149.
Communion of Saints, 33, 44, 45, 55, 247.
Comprehensive, not, 281.
Conceived, 33, 39.
Conscience chiefly prohibitory, 201.
Conservation, 131.
Constantinople, 74, 79.
Constantinople, C. of, 59, 60, 61, 63, 65, 70-74, 77;
second C. of, 74, 175;
C. of (536), 73.
Constantinopolitan Cr., 33, 38, 41, 48, 58, 61, 62, 66, 67, 82, 84, 303.
Constantius, Emperor, 59.
'Contesseravit,' 20.
Cornelius, Pope, 22.
Corranza, *Summa Concilia*, 84.
Cotton Library, 4, 87.
Crabbe, Peter, *Concilia Omnia*, 84.
Creation, a revelation of God, 112;
three divisions of, 130.
Creation, of, 129-131.
'Creator of heaven and earth,' 37.
Creed, a, peculiar to Christianity, ix;
derivation of, 104, 105.
Creed of—
S. Ambrose, 295;
Aphraates, 294;
S. Athanasius, 304;
Athelstan's Psalter, 301;
S. Augustine, 296;
Bangor Antiphonary, 300;
S. Cæsarius of Arles, 297;
Constantinople, 303;
S. Cyprian of Carthage, 293;
S. Cyprian of Toulon, 298;
S. Cyril Hier., 303;
S. Dionysius of Rome, 293;
Etherius and Beatus, 299;
Eusebius Cæsarea, 302;
Facundus Hermianensis, 298;
Faustus of Riez, 297;
S. Gregory Thaumaturgus, 294;
S. Ildefonsus, 298;
S. Irenæus, 291, 292;
Laudianus Codex, 301;
Marcellus of Ancyra, 295;
S. Martin of Bracara, 298;
S. Maximus of Turin, 297;
Missale Gallicanum, 301;
Mozarabic Liturgy, 302;
Nicæa, 302;
S. Nicetas of Remesiana, 295;
Novatian, 294;
Peter Chrysologus, 297;
Perminius, 299;
Priscillianus, 296;
Rufinus, 295;
Sacramentarium Gallicanum, 300;
Tertullian, 292, 293;
Venantius Fortunatus, 299;
S. Victricius of Rouen, 296.
Creeds, historical method of treating, xiv.

Dalmatia, 74.
Damascus, S. John of, 116.
Damian, S. Peter, 81.
'Dead,' 33, 39.

Denebert, Bp. of Worcester, 89.
Deposit of faith, 109.
'Deposit,' S. Paul's use of, xii.
'Descendit ad inferos,' 92, 95.
Descent into Hell, of the, 173-180.
'Deum,' 39.
Difference of Eastern and Western Creeds, 32, 33.
Diogenes, Bp. of Cyzicus, 65.
Dionysius, S., Pope, 22, 36, 126, 293.
Disciplina Arcani, 19, 31.
Distribution, a, 244.
Docetæ, heresy of, 175.
Doctrine, its source, 109;
its two streams, 109.
Dogma, the foundation of morals in Christ's teaching, and in that of the writers of the Epistles, xi, xii.
Dogmatic method of treating the Creeds, xiv.
Donatists, 231, 232.
Dorholt, Dr. B., 9.
Dualist Gnostics, 130.
Duchesne, 56.
Durandus Mimatensis, 58.

Ecstasy, 285.
Eginhard, 80.
Egyptian Bishops, 66, 71.
Eleutherius, 27.
Eleutheropolis, 71.
Elipandus, 80.
Ephesus, 35, 36, 52, 74.
Ephesus, C. of, 58-65, 71, 72.
Epiphanius, S., 14, 15, 20.
Epiphanius, S., Bp. of Salamis, 63, 70, 71, 72, 211.
Episcopal Charges referring to Athanasian Cr., 88, 89.
'Epistola Canonica,' 92.
Erasmus, 3.
Essence of God is one, 120.
Eternal punishment, 203, 259, 275, 276.
Eternity an attribute of God, 118.
Eternity, definition of, 286.
Etherius Uxamensis, 39, 41, 46, 299.
Eucharistic Sacrifice, 171.
Eucherius of Troyes, S., 54.
Eugenius IV., Pope, 82.
Eunomius, 62.
Eusebius, 34, 50, 59, 60, 79, 302.
Euthymius Zigadenus, 197.
Eutychianism and the Athanasian Cr., 96, 97.
Eutychianism condemned, 145.
Evagrius, 58.
Excellence, method of, 112.
External evidence of date of Athanasian Cr., 87.

Facundus Hermianensis, 298.
Faith,
derivation of, 104, 105;
definition of, 105, 106;
motive of, 106;
sphere of, 106, 107;
subject-matter of, 107;
object of, 107;
the act of, 107, 108;
three subjective causes of, 107, 108;
used in two senses, 108;
value of, 108;
delivered at Pentecost, 108, 109.
'Father,' 33, 37, 53.
'Father Almighty,' of the, 128, 129.
'Father,' used essentially and personally, 128.
Faustus of Riez, 40, 42, 43, 44, 46, 54, 55, 247, 249, 250, 297.
'Felix Culpa,' 142.
Ffoulkes, E., 9.
'Filioque,' 57, 76-82, 88, 94, 99, 212.
Flavian Epistle, 16, 61.
Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.*, 180.
Florence, C. of, 82.
Florus the Deacon, 87.
Forbes, Bp. A. P., 252.
Forgiveness of sins, of the, 253-262.
Forgiveness, what it is, 256-259.
Fortunatus, V., 41, 43, 47, 90.
Francis of Assisi, S., 243.
Frankfort, C. of, 79.
Free-will, Calvinism and rationalism, 254;
demanded by a sense of responsibility, 254, 255;
free-will, heredity, and environment, 254.
Frejus, 54.
Fruili, C. of, 79.
Fulgentius, S., 147.

Gallia Narbonensis, 75.
Gallican Missals, 42, 43.
Gallican Sacramentary, 39.
Gaul, 80, 82.
Gaul, Southern, 53, 55, 86.
Gehenna, 174.
Generation, eternal, of the Son, 120, 136.
Gennadius of Marseilles, 248.
Gentilly, C. of, 78.
Germany, 80, 82.
Glorified body, 273.
Gnostics, 264.
God,
definition of, 110;
revealed through the Incarnation, 110;
knowledge of, 111;
omniscience of, 111, 112;
omnipotence of, 111;
love of, 111;
His attributes are His Essence, 113;
His nature, revelation of, 113.
names of in Old Testament, 113;
as spirit, 113, 114;
as light, 113, 114;
as love, 114;
perfection of, 116;
attributes, divisions of, 116, 117;
infinity of, 117;
immutability of, 117;
immensity of, 118;
incomprehensibility of, 118.
'God Almighty,' 37.
'God of God,' 76, 82.
'Gratia gratis data,' 242.
'Gratia gratum faciens,' 242, 243.
Gregorian Sacramentary, 47.
Gregory Nazianzus, S., 129, 252.
Gregory of Nyssa, S., 252.
Gregory Thaumaturgus, S., 50, 126, 294.
Gregory the Great, 4, 81, 197, 252.
Guilt, sense of, 159.
Gundobad, Arian king, 93.

'Habere,' 95.
Hades, 174-180.
Hahn, L., 55.
Hahn's Bibliothek, 3rd ed., 6, 7, 11, 32, 38, 55.
Harmonia Symbolica, 4.
Harnack, A., 6, 23, 25, 27, 42, 44, 45, 50, 51, 98, 247, 248, 249, xvi.
Harvey, 97.
Hayto, Bp. of Basle, 89, 98.
Healing, a charisma, 244.
Heaven, positive joys of, 281, 285;
negative joys of, 285, 286;
eternity of, 286.
Hebrews, Epist. to the, titles of Christ to royal Priesthood, 192-196.
Hell, God's view of sin, 255.
Hell, meaning of, 173, 174.
Henry II., Emperor, 76.
Hermas, 37.
Herovall Canons, 91.
Heurtley, Dr. C. A., 3, 4, 5, 43.
High priest, office of, 194.
Hilary of Arles, S., 54, 86, 97.
Hilary of Poitiers, S., 79, 211.
Hilsey, Bp. of Rochester, 99.
Hincmar, Abp. of Rheims, 82.
Hippolytus, S., 35, 37, 51, 126, 151.
Historical method of treating Creeds, xiv.
'Holiness,' second note of the Church, 229;
essential and ideal, 230.
'Holy,' 76, 83.
Holy Ghost,
spiration of, active and passive, 121;
of the, 209-223;
a divine person, Lord and Life-giver; other divine attributes ascribed to Him in Holy Scripture, 209, 210;
procession of the, difference between East and West, 211;
work of, before the Incarnation, 212-217;
as the agent of the Incarnation, 147, 217-219;
after the Incarnation, 219, 220;
agent in creation, 212, 213;
perfecter of the work of God, 213;
acting upon the consciences of men, 215;
work of in Mosaic dispensation, 216;
as the bond of union, 218;
His work typified by Noah's dove, 219;

Holy Ghost,
gifts of, 222;
fruits of, 223;
Holy Ghost and Baptism, 221.
Holy Scripture, 109.
Honoratus, S., 54, 86, 97.
Honorius, Pope, 151.
Hornbach, 12.
Hort, Dr. F. J. A., 66, 70, 71;
his *Christian Ecclesia*, 224.
'Hujus,' 47.
Human nature, 143.
Human person, a, 143, 144.
Hutchings, *The Personal Work of the Holy Ghost*, 215, 217.
Hyginus, Pope, 24.
Hyldrad, the Abbot, 87.
Hymenæus, 264.
Hypostatic union, 149, 175.

'I BELIEVE,' 43, 84.
Ignatius, S., 29, 231, 233.
Ignatius of Loyola, S., 243.
Ildefonsus, S., 41, 298.
Immanent procession, 121.
Immensity, God's, 118.
'Immensus,' 118.
Immutability, God's, 117.
'Impartibilis et impassibilis,' 117.
Impassibility, 271.
Incarnation,
of the, 140-152;
relation to the doctrine of God, of the Holy Spirit, of the Atonement, 141;
defined by Œcumenical C.s, 144-146;
stated in Article ii., summed up in S. John i. 14, 141;
purpose of, 142;
from great heresies against, 145;
Holy Ghost, agent of, 147.
Incomprehensibility, God's, 118.
'Inferna,' 'inferos,' ad, 12, 41, 92, 95, 174.
Infinity, God's, 117.
Infinity of God's knowledge, 115.
Intellect, the, 277, 280-285.
Intelligence, a property of Spirit, 115.
Intercession of Christ, 197.
Intermediate state, 177, 178;
three views of, 178-181;
Eastern view, 178;
Paradise view, 180;
Western view, 180.
Internal evidence of date of Athanasian Cr., 94.
Invocation of Saints, 251.
Irenæus, S., 20, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 35-39, 43, 46, 51, 55, 291, 292, xiii.
Isidore of Seville, S., 21, 24, 75, 92.
Italy, 80.
Ivo of Chartres, S., 45.

JEHOVAH, 115, 138.
Jerome, S., 13, 27, 45, 147, 192, 252, 264.
Jerusalem, 74, 80.
Jerusalem, C. of (536), 73.
Jerusalem, Cr. of, 66, 67, 69, 70, 173.
'Jesus,' 132, 133.
Jesus Christ, of, 132-136.
Jesus Christ our Lord, of, 138, 139.
John, Abbot of Biclaro, 78.
John of Antioch, 61.
John of Jerusalem, 80.
John XXII., Pope, 180.
Journal of Theological Studies, Dr. Sanday in, 10, 46, 50.
Judge, the, the Son of Man, 202.
Judgment,
one of the fundamental religious ideas; follows from the idea of responsibility, 200;
taught by natural religion; its characteristics shown by revelation, 201;
also its searching character, and our responsibility for opportunities and gifts, 201;
matter of, 203;
realisation of, a great grace, 204;
implies self-examination, 204.
Julius, Pope, 14, 20.
Justification,
treatment of, 184-188;
five causes of, 186, 187;
means of, 187;
effects of, 187.
Justin, Emperor, 75, 78.
Justinian, Emperor, 73, 74.

Justin Martyr, 28, 29, 126.

Kattenbusch, Dr., 8, 25, 27, 31, 38, 41, 50, 52, 55, 86, 94, 95.
Kenotists, 123, 151.
King, Lord, 4.
Kingly office of Christ, 134.
Kirsch, Dr. J. P., 8, 55.
Knowledge, imperfection of, 279.
Kunze, Dr. J., 8, 52.

Laity, priesthood of, 135.
Laudianus Codex, 43, 47.
Leger, S., Bp. of Orleans, 91.
Leibnitz, *Essais de Théodicée*, ix.
Leo Allatius, 99, 180.
Leo I., Pope, 14, 61.
Leo III., Pope, 75, 81.
Lerins, 53, 54, 55, 86.
Leslie Stephen, 246.
Lessius, 285.
'Life everlasting,' 15, 33, 34, 48.
Light of glory, the, 282, 284.
Limbus Patrum, 176.
Lombard, Peter, 58, 214.
Loofs, Dr., 8, 52, 98.
Lothair Psalter, 87.
Love, imperfection of, 279.
Lumby, Dr. J. R., 9, 58, 97.
Lupus of Troyes, S., 54.
Luther, 154.
Lutheran Kenotism, 151.
Lutheran theory of justification, 185.
Lyons, 35, 36, 54.

Mabillon, 11.
Macarius, Bp., Greek theologian, 179.
Macedonius, 57, 60.
'Maker of heaven and earth,' 33.
Man, a social being, as such salvable, 225.
Manicheans, 264.
Marcellus of Ancyra, 9, 14, 15, 21, 22, 25, 29, 53, 263, 295.
Marcion, 24, 26, 264.
Marcus Eremita, 8.
Mark of Arethusa, 41.
Mark of Ephesus, 82.
Marseilles, 54.
Martin of Bracara, S., 41, 298.
Maximus of Turin, S., 13, 47, 297.
Means, Stewart, 7.
Melchizedek, a type of Christ, 191.
Meletius, S., 71.
Melito of Sardis, 50.
Mercator, Isidorus, 84.
Mercy and justice defined, 256, 257.
Merlin, *Quatuor Concilia*, 84.
Mesopotamian Cr., 66, 70.
Methods, three, 112.
Metz, 54, 56.
Migne's *Patrologia*, xvi.
Milan, 53.
Ministry, a charisma, 244.
Ministry, Christian, three views of, 239.
Missale Gallicanum, 42, 43, 301.
Moberly's *Atonement and Personality*, 172, 259.
Ministerial Priesthood, 235.
Monarchianists, 24, 26, 34, 36, 53, 130.
Monks of Mt. of Olives, 71, 80, 88.
Monothelite heresy, 151, 152.
Morawski, M., 9.
Morin, Dom, on Athanasian Cr., 86, 97.
Mortal sin, characteristics of, 204.
Mosaic code of sacrifice, 162.
Mosaic cosmogony, 130.
Mosaic dispensation, work of the Holy Ghost therein, 216.
Mozarabic Liturgy, 41, 44, 302.

Negative method, the, 112.
Nemesius, 46.
Nestorianism and Athanasian Cr., 96, 97.
Nestorianism condemned, 145.
Nestorius, 60, 61, 65.
Nice, 54.
Nicæa, C. of, 57, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 70;
second C. of, 79.
Nicene Cr., 32, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 73, 74, 79, 82, 92, 263, 302.
Nicetas of Remesiana, S., 9, 55, 247, 248, 250, 295.
Nicholas I., Pope, 82.
Niké, 41.
Noetus, 35.
'Norma prædicationis,' xiv.
Notions, five in the Godhead, 122.
Novatian, 22, 39, 294.
Novatians, 231.

Ommaney, on Athanasian Cr., 86, 87, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 97.
'Omnipotentem,' 38.
'Omnium peccatorum,' 46.
'Only-begotten,' 38.
Only Begotten Son, of the, 136-138.
Oratorian Commentary, 90.
Origen, 51, 126, 156, 157, 252, 264; his theory of a ransom, 157.
Orleans Commentary, 90.
Oxenham, H. N., 158.

Palmatius, 43.
Pannonia, 53.
Paradise, 176, 177.
Parallel Creeds, 15, 68.
Paris, 90.
Passion, the, God's view of sin, 255.
Patria, in, 280.
Patripassians, 37, 53, 123.
Paulinus of Aquileia, 79, 80.
Paulinus of Nola, S., 248.
Paul of Samosata, 49.
Pearson, Bp., 4.
Penance, Sacrament of, 262.
Pentecost, faith delivered at, 108, 109.
Pepin, 56.
'Perfection,' 277-280.
Perichoresis, 123.
Perrone, 252.
'Personæ,' 126, 127.
Persons, three in the Godhead, 122.
Petavius, 252.
Peter Abelard, 45, 46.
Peter Chrysologus, S., 43, 297.
Peter Damian, S., 81.
Peter Fullo, 74.
Philadelphian Cr., 60, 70-72.
Philetus, 264.
Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 82.
Pirminius, 11, 31, 33, 53, 56, 299.
Pitisco, 20.
Pius, Pope, 24.
Pneumatomachi, 57, 60, 62, 63, 67.
Polycarp, S., 27, 37, 231.
Pontius Pilate, 40.
Positive Method, the, 112.
Pothinus, 27.
Praxeas, 24.
Prayer and God's attributes, 111, 112.
Priesthood, an organ of the Body of Christ, 238;
of the laity, 135, 233.
Priest, office of, 194.
Priestly office of Christ, 134.
Primasius, 197.
Primer (English), 99.
Priscillian, 40, 42, 296.
Procession, immanent, 121.
Processions, two in the Divine Essence, 120.
'Pro nostra salute,' 92.
Prophecy, a charisma, 244.
Prophets denounced outward sacrifice, 163.
'Prophets who spake by the,' 212.
Propitiation, Christ's, 168.
Psalterium Aethelstani, 22, 23.
Puritans, 231, 232.
Pusey, 78, 212, xiii.

Qāhāl, 224.
Quick and dead, the, 203.

Rationalism and free-will, 254.
Ratramn of Corbey, 82.
Real-Encyclopädie, 7, 45.
Reccared, 77.
Reconciliation,
to God, 155, 158;
as the death of the Son of God, 158;
as the Blood of Christ, 158;
as the Blood of the Cross, 158;
of God and man by Christ's sacrifice, 171.
'Redditio Symboli,' 21.
Reformation theory of the Atonement, 153, 154.
Regeneration, 26.
Relation of Eastern and Western Creeds, 49.
Relations, four in Godhead, 122.
Remigius, S., 56.
Resurrection,
of Christ, 181;
S. Paul's teaching of, 181;
S. Peter's, 181;
evidence for Christ, 183, 184;
justification associated with, 184;
of the dead, 263-274;

Resurrection,
S. Paul's use of 'flesh,' 'body,' and 'dead,' 263;
body, what it is not, 265;
body, risen characteristics of, 266, 269, 270;
faith of, 266;
mode of, 266, 267, 268.
Resurrection and Baptism, 189.
'Reviviscens,' 41.
Riez, 54.
Rome, 80.
Rouen, 56.
Rufinus, 12, 13, 14, 19, 23, 24, 33, 37, 40, 42, 47, 128, 173, 264, 295.
'Rule of faith,' 8, 17, 21, 26.
'Rule of truth,' 20, 27.
'Rule,' S. Paul's use of, xii.
Rupertus, 220.

Sabellianism, 123, 126.
'Sacramentarium Gelasianum,' 14, 47.
'Sacramentarium Gregorianum,' 47.
'Sacramentum fidei,' 17.
Sacrifice,
has two effects, 160;
its nature and essential idea, 160, 161;
sin and penitence only secondary ideas, 161;
two parts, inward and outward, 162;
true and proper, 163;
danger of separating these, 163;
in Christ, every sacrificial idea fulfilled, 163;
dedication of victim, 164;
identification, of victim, with offerer, 164;
effusion of blood, 165;
cremation of victim, 167.
Sacrifice, Eucharistic, 171;
of cross, 171.
'Saint,' meaning of, in Creed, 248, 250.
Saints,
cultus of, 45;
in heaven, difference of, 282;
beatitude of, 283;
threefold knowledge of, 283.
Sales, S. Francis of, 243.
Salvian, S., 54.
'Sanctorum,' as neuter, 249.
'Sanctorum Communio,' 9, 248-251.
Sanday, Dr. W., 10, 46, 50, 51, 52, 249.
Sanders, T. B., 7.
Savonarola, 243.
Scotists, 285.
Scotus, Duns, 142.
Self-examination, difficulties of, 204;
the Holy Ghost our help, 204.
'Sensual,' 273.
Sheol, 174.
Shields, inscribed with Cr., 81.
Simplicity, God's, 117.
Sin,
two effects of, 159;
mortal and venial, 204, 207;
natural and formal, 206;
its nature, 253, 254;
its malice, 255;
two revelations of, 255;
remission of, 260.
Sins of omission, 202, 208.
Sirmium, 41.
Sirmondus, 92.
Sixtus III., Pope, 14.
Smyrna, 35, 36, 51, 52.
Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.*, 59.
Solidarity of human race, 225.
Sonship of Christ, 136;
ours, 136.
'Soul,' 273, 281.
Southern Gaul, 53, 55, 249.
Spain, 53, 75, 82.
Spiration, of the Holy Ghost, 121;
active and passive, 121.
'Spirit,' 273, 281.
Spirit, property of, 115.
'Spiritual,' 273.
Stavelot Commentary, 90.
Steamship, engine of, 278.
Stephen, Leslie, 246.
Suarez, 285.
Subordination of the Son, 137, 138.
'Sub Pontio Pilato,' 9.
'Substance,' 'Substantia,' 126, 127.
Subtlety, 272.
'Suffered,' 33, 39, 40.
Surius, 43.
Swainson, Canon, 9, 62, 63, 74, 86, 97.
Swete, Dr. H. B., 7.

Symbolism, 19, 20, 21, xiv;
its meaning, 19.
Syria, 74.
Syriac *Testamentum*, 41.

Tarasius of Constantinople, 79, 211.
Teaching, a charisma, 244.
Tertullian, 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43, 46, 125, 126, 177, 234, 240, 262, 264, 292, 293.
'Tessera,' 20, 26.
Theandric acts of Christ, 148.
Theodoret, 196, 198.
Theodorus Lector, 74, 75.
Theodosius, Emperor, 60.
Theodotus, 241.
Theophilus of Antioch, 125.
Thomas Aquinas, S., 142, 271, 272, 286.
Thomists, 285.
Timotheus of Constantinople, 74.
Toledo,
third C. of, 75, 77, 82, 84.
fourth C. of, 92, 95.
sixth C. of, 91.
Tome of Constantinople, 60.
Tradition, 109.
'Traditio Symboli,' 21, 92.
Treves Fragment, 90.
Trinity, Holy, of the, 118-127.
'Trinity,' its history, 125.
Tritheism, 123.
Troyes, 54.
Troyes Commentary, 90.
Tryphon, 28.
Tyre, 74.

'Unde,' 42.
'Unicum,' 38.
'Unigenitum,' 38.
Unity,
numerical, individual, personal, 124, 125;
first note of the Church, 226;
two conceptions of, 226;
three erroneous views of, 227;
essential and ideal, 228.
Ussher, Abp., 3, 4, 14, 87, 97.
Utrecht Psalter, 4, 87.

valence, 54.
Valentinus, 24, 26.
Valla, Laurentius, 3.
Venantius Fortunatus, 41, 43, 4, 90, 299.
Venial sin, remitted by prayer; does not diminish grace; does diminish fervour; hinders grace God would give us, and disposes the soul for mortal sin, 207.
'Via, in,' 280.
Vicarious character of Christ's offering, 169.
'Victor ascendit,' 42.
Victor, Pope, 27, 126.
Victor, S., Monastery of, 54.
Victricius of Rouen, S., 42, 96, 296.
Vienne, 35, 54;
C. of, 282.
Vigilantius, 45, 248, 252.
Vigilius of Thapsus, 14.
Vincent of Lerins, S., 54, 86, 94, 96, 97, 232.
Vincent of Paul, S., 243.
Virgin birth, the, 143.
'Vivus a mortuis,' 41.
Voss, J. G., 3, 58, 97.

Walch, 4.
Ward, Mrs. Humphry, 6.
Way of Causality, of Removal, of Excellence, 112.
Westcott, Bp., 197.
Wetstein, 301.
Will of God,
its primary object; its secondary, 115;
antecedent and consequent, 115;
God's good pleasure, and revealed Will, 115.
'With the,' 277, 280, 281, 284, 285.
Witsen, H., 4.
'World,' the, used in various senses; Christ the Saviour of, 225.

Zaccaria, 75.
Zahn, Dr. T., 7, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 32, 34, 36, 46, 52, 53, 126, 248, 249.
Zephyrinus, S., Pope, 34, 126.

GREEK WORDS

αἰώνιος, 276.
ἀντί, 156.
ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως. ἀχωρίστως, 146.
βουλή, 116.
δικαιοῦν, 185.
δοῦλος, 139.
ἐκκλησία, 224.
ἕνα, 'one,' 32, 34, 35, 36, 53.
ἐπίσκοποι, 234.
ἴδιον σῶμα, 269.
κανών, xii.
καταλλαγή, 158.
κένωσις, 151.
κύριος, 138.
λογική, 165.
μάθημα, 52.
μονογενῆ, 136.
ὁμοούσιον, 59, 70.
οὐσία, 126, 127.
παρακαταθήκη, xii.
πνευματικός, 165, 272.
πρεσβύτεροι, 234.
ψυχικός, 272, 273.
σαρκός, 263.
θέλημα, 116.
τελειότης, 278.
τέλος, 278.
τύπος διδαχῆς, xii.
ὑπέρ, 156.
ὑπόστασις, 126, 127.
χάρις, 242.
χαρίσματα, 242.

INDEX OF TEXTS

	PAGE
Genesis i. 1, 2, 31,	213
3,	185
vi. 2, 3,	215
viii. 8-12,	219
xxi. 33,	276
Exodus xi. 15,	133
xxiii. 7,	185
xxxiv. 6, 7,	160
7,	185
Leviticus i. 3, 4,	164
iv. 5, 7,	166
Numbers xi. 16, 17,	216
xiii. 16,	132
xiv. 6,	132
Deuteronomy vi. 4,	118
vii. 11,	216
xxxii. 6,	128
1 Samuel xv. 1,	133
xvi. 13,	133
1 Kings xvii. 22,	182
xix. 15, 16,	133
2 Kings iv. 34,	182
xiii. 21,	182
1 Chronicles xxiv. 11,	132
Job xxxiii. 12,	276
Psalms xvii. 15,	287
xxiv. 7,	198
xxxvi. 8, 9,	287
xlv. 13,	136
li. 17,	163
cx. 1, 4,	191
cxxxiii. 1, 2,	135
2,	222
cxlviii. 5,	185
Proverbs viii. 22,	142
xxiv. 12,	283
16,	206
Isaiah i. 11, 13,	163
xi. 2,	150, 219, 221
28,	276
xxvi. 4,	276
xxxiii. 17,	279

	PAGE
Isaiah lxi. 1,	134
lxiii. 16,	128
Ezekiel xxxvii. 9, 10,	220
Hosea vi. 6,	163
Zechariah ix. 9,	134
11, 12,	176
Wisdom i. 7,	210
S. Matthew i. 21,	132
iv. 8,	225
v. 48,	278
vi. 14, 15,	257
vii. 20,	222
viii. 12,	203
x. 28,	203
xii. 36,	201
xiii. 24-31,	231
40,	225
43,	271
47-51,	231
xv. 19,	201
xvi. 18,	224, 245
26,	225
27,	283
xvii. 2,	271
xviii. 15,	258
17,	224
21, 22,	258
23, 25,	202
35,	257, 258
xx. 28,	158
xxii. 30,	269
xxv. 1-14, 14-31, 31-46,	202
31,	203
41,	203, 275
45,	203
46,	203, 275
xxvi. 39,	164
63, 64,	x
xxvii. 51,	167
xxviii. 9,	232
17,	183

	PAGE
S. Matthew xxviii. 18, . .	139
19, .	210, 232
S. Mark i. 15, . . .	xi
vii. 21, . . .	201
ix. 43-48, . . .	203
xv. 38, . . .	167
xvi. 11, . . .	183
15, . . .	232
S. Luke i. 31, . . .	132
33, . . .	286
35, .	134, 147, 218
70, . . .	225
ii. 21, . . .	132
52, . . .	150
iv. 22, . . .	134
vi. 37, . . .	257
vii. 14, . . .	182
viii. 54, . . .	182
x. 16, . . .	244
xiv. 18, 21, .	134
xvi. 1-13, . .	201
2, . . .	204
19-31, . .	201
23, . . .	176
xvii. 3, 4, . .	258
xix. 11-28, . .	202
xxiii. 43, . .	174, 176
45, . . .	167
xxiv. 45, . . .	183
41-43, . .	183, 265
50, 51, . .	191
S. John i. 14, . .	141
14-18, . . .	38
ii. 19, . . .	182
32, . . .	219
iii. 5, . . .	225
5, 6, . . .	137
14, 15, . .	158
16, . .	142, 225
16-18, . . .	38
6, 17, . . .	155
17, . .	120, 225
34, . .	150, 219
iv. 7, 11, 20, 21, .	257
17, 18, . . .	279
24, . . .	114
34, . .	152, 202
34, 35, . . .	279
42, . . .	225
v. 22, . . .	202
vi. 33, 51, . .	225
44, . . .	108
viii. 32, . . .	245

	PAGE
S. John ix. 6, 7, . . .	148
x. 9, . . .	167
11, 15, 18, . .	159
18, . . .	182
30, . . .	123
xi. 43, . . .	182
xii. 47, . . .	225
xiv. 2, . . .	283
6, . .	167, 244
9, 11, . . .	123
16, 17, 26, . .	108
23, . . .	188
26, . . .	120
28, . . .	137
30, . . .	225
xv. 13, . . .	159
15, . . .	187
26, .	108, 120, 121
xvi. 13, .	108, 210, 245
xvii. 3, . . .	110
14, . . .	225
21-23, . . .	227
xviii. 37, . . .	x
xx. 9, . . .	183
Acts i. 3, 22, . . .	181
ii. 24, 31, . .	181
26, 27, 31, . .	174
27, ...	41
iii. 26, ...	181
iv. 27, ...	221
v. 3, ...	210
x. 38, . . .	134, 221
40, ...	181
42, ...	203
xiii. 30, ...	181
xvii. 3, 18, 31, 32, . .	181
xxiii. 6, ...	181
xxv. 19, ...	181
xxvi. 23, ...	181
Romans i. 4, . . .	181
19, 20, . . .	110
iii. 22-25, . . .	168
iv. 24,25, . . .	181
25, . . .	184
v. 6, 8, 10, . .	159
10, 11, . . .	158
vi. 4, 9, . . .	181
9, . . .	182
17, . . .	xii
vii. 12, . . .	216
viii. 11, . .	181, 210
13, 14, . . .	215
15, 16, . . .	128

	PAGE
Romans viii. 29,	279
32,	158
x. 9, 10,	107
15,	233
xi. 15,	158, 225
xii. 4,	237
6,	243
6-9,	241
xvi. 26,	276
1 Corinthians ii. 6,	279
7,	142
10,	119, 210
14-16,	261
iii. 8,	283
16,	261
17,	188
vi. 19,	188, 261
viii. 6,	138
ix. 10,	279
xii. 3,	138
4,	237, 241
8-11,	241
12, 13,	226, 237
13,	227
14-19,	237
18,	238
25, 26,	250, 252
28,	241
xiii. 8,	284
12,	107, 156, 279, 281
xv. 5-9,	184
15, 17,	181
17,	184
17, 18,	182
28,	137, 251
37,	269
38,	269
39, 40, 42,	263
41,	283
43,	182
2 Corinthians v. 14, 15, 18, 20,	158
17,	184
19,	225
vii. 10,	253
ix. 6,	283
xii. 2, 4,	176
xiii. 14,	210
Galatians i. 8,	109
ii. 20,	158, 225, 285
vi. 16,	xii
Ephesians i. 22,	139
ii. 8,	108

	PAGE
Ephesians ii. 13-18,	158
16,	159
20,	233
iv. 3, 4,	228
5,	260
7,	243
8,	191
11, 12,	241
13,	279
16,	250
v. 2,	158, 168
25,	158
25-27,	230
Philippians i. 8,	107
ii. 6, 7,	151
6, 7, 8,	155
8, 9,	159
iii. 10,	181
13, 14,	280
15,	279
Colossians i. 15,	142
16, 17,	148
20, 22,	158
21, 22,	159
iii. 1, 3,	188
14,	278
iv. 12,	279
1 Thessalonians iv. 17,	203
v. 9, 10,	158
23,	272
2 Thessalonians ii. 15,	109
1 Timothy ii. 4,	225
iii.,	233
15,	244
iv. 14,	233, 238
v. 22,	233
vi. 20,	xiii
2 Timothy i. 6,	233
13, 14,	xiii
ii. 2,	109
8,	181
18,	264
iv. 1,	203
Titus i. 6,	233
ii. 13, 14,	159
Hebrews i. 1,	ix
ii. 14, 15,	159
iv. 15,	202
vii. 24, 25, 27,	193
27,	195
ix. 7,	195
8,	166
12, 24, 26, 28,	195

	PAGE
Hebrews ix. 24,	196
x. 10,	195
xii. 1,	252
14,	230
xiii. 8,	149
12,	159
S. James iii. 2,	279
1 S. Peter i. 3,	181
19,	165
ii. 5, 9,	135
9,	236
24,	159
iii. 18,	159
18, 19, 20,	174
21,	181
iv. 5,	203
2 S. Peter i. 4,	188
1 S. John i. 5,	114
7,	260
ii. 1, 2,	168
1 S. John iii. 2,	188
4,	254
9,	188
iv. 8, 16,	114
10,	169, 225
14,	225
v. 16,	207
16, 17,	205
xi. 2,	225
xii. 24,	268
S. Jude 3,	109
14,	203
Revelation ii. 7,	176
iii. 21,	199
vi. 9, 10,	177
vii. 16,	266, 269
xx. 12,	203
xxi. 4,	286
14,	233
xxii. 2, 14,	177

Edinburgh : Printed by T. and A. CONSTABLE.